WHAT HAPPENED IN PALESTINE

MAURICE SAMUEL

JUL 25 1960

LIBRARY OF
EVANGELICAL SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY

No. 1722

DONOR Prof. Vergil Zener

WHAT HAPPENED IN PALESTINE

WHAT HAPPENED IN PALESTINE

THE EVENTS OF AUGUST, 1929
THEIR BACKGROUND AND
THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

By

MAURICE SAMUEL

Author of
You Gentiles, The Outsider, etc.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
DS
126
.S2
1929 49,869
1722
EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE STRATFORD COMPANY, *Publishers*
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

COPYRIGHT — 1929 — BY
THE STRATFORD COMPANY
Publishers
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

First Printing	October 15, 1929
Second Printing	October 17, 1929
Third Printing	October 19, 1929
Fourth Printing	October 22, 1929

PRINTED BY
THE ALPINE PRESS, INC., BOSTON, MASS.

Acknowledgment

I wish to make acknowledgment of the devoted coöperation of Mr. David Horowitz, of Tel Aviv, in the compilation of much of the material and the careful checking of facts.

M. S.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

JUL 25 1960

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOG

Contents

I	Personal Problems	9
II	Group Problems	22
III	Provocation and Connivance	37
IV	The Funeral Incident	58
V	The Riots in Tel Aviv	65
VI	Rousing the Arab Mob	85
VII	Jerusalem	101
VIII	Hebron and Safed	115
IX	"Neutrality"	124
X	The Protest of the Jews of Palestine	149
XI	The Southern Colonies	160
XII	The Emek and the North	178
XIII	Foundations of Peace	194

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

WHAT HAPPENED IN PALESTINE

CHAPTER I

Personal Problems

IT was five years, almost to a day, since I had last seen the country. Since that first happy visit, I might, with a little effort, have made a second and a third. But I was reluctant to come to Palestine again as a visitor. I knew that before long I would have to make Palestine my home—our home—and a visit more or less had little meaning.

For I was not concerned with the type of problem which can be studied from the outside. I was concerned with the inner meaning of the impulse called Zionism and with its effect on the minds of men. There are certain experiences for which the imagination has no substitute. I could think myself into the position of such a man as myself, such a family as mine, transplanted into Palestine. I could formulate its difficulties and successes. But I knew that until we had taken the final step, and actually made the coun-

try our own, the natural movement of the problems in my mind would not ensue.

I was, moreover, sick of talking and writing Zionism—and had been for some time. The philosophy of Zionism has quite naturally exhausted itself. The arguments are completed, both sides of the case have been fixed, and there is nothing more to say. This means that the first, the argumentative side of Zionism, has passed into history. The new value of the Zionist movement must proceed now from the character of the work in Palestine. Models and symbols of human creation—with a special value for Jews, and a general value for all men and women—must emerge from the trials and efforts of the Jewish homeland in the making. Wherever men work in contact with the foundations of life (physical foundations, cultural, economic) they present new patterns of being, new types of experience. Zionism is at this stage now.

It was not so much the amount of time one spent in the country, as the attitude toward it. I had to revaluate now all the questions of my own life and of the life of my children in a new terminology. And you cannot play with this sort of thing intellectually. You are either part of it, and therefore are driven by personal needs to look long and carefully at every aspect of every question; or you are not part of it, and you may toy with suggestions and

ideas all your life, without knowing whether you have found your truth or not.

I came to Palestine in early July, 1929, not in the mood of the visitor. I would not rush the country. I would wait and fit my mind to it. I would be quiet and receptive where, five years before, I had been restless and acquisitive of emotions and ideas. It was impossible now to question Palestine, for actually I had to wait for the country to question me.

So for the first six weeks I did not stir out of Tel Aviv. Jerusalem is less than two hours away by machine, and from there you can reach the Valley of Jezreel and Upper Galilee in half a day. But there was no point in travelling. True to my expectation, the contact with Palestine under these new, intimate conditions, had given a different form to all my questions; but the answers had to come slowly and organically. These were questions I could not press. For even while I answered them they unfolded and changed form, and began to envelope me closer. I paid only indirect attention to them, for fear of being importunate. I occupied myself with other questions. I wrote on themes which had carried over from that Western World which I would henceforth regard with the eyes of a stranger. And I thought of my personal problems in a haphazard, disconnected way.

Even thus there was much to think of. My wife

and children had gone ahead of me by nearly a year. I found the little ones, to my rather foolish astonishment, speaking a livelier and more fluent Hebrew than myself—and forgetting their English and German. Now, for the first time, I understood the fulness of the responsibility which we had taken upon ourselves. I had always believed deeply, strongly, that for the reconstruction of the healthy Jewish mind there was needed a return to the language, as well as the country. We Jews had known, in our time, too many languages not our own. And what is a language if not the actual form of the culture of a people, incorporating, in its spirit, its idioms and its very borrowings, a long history of experience? And here we Jews were, adapting ourselves every century or two, every generation or two, to the experience of other peoples, as expressed in their languages. We learned to unlearn. If we were to be whole, productive, strong, this trading in cultural heritages had to stop.

And I wanted to save my children from the torment of an inner division, the banal problems of "Jew by faith and Jew by race." To be wholly something, or not to be it at all, is the first requisite of mental health. Even in her seventh year my daughter began to show the first symptoms of unease, to ask questions to which there was no answer, unless

that can be called an answer which makes the question more acute.

But here, when I came face to face with it, I was taken aback. Was I prepared to put these children into a corner of the Near East? Make Hebrew—that still isolated language—the natural medium of their lives? Turn them over to something which doubtless was whole and complete but (here was the question) perhaps not adequate to the full modern intellectual development I wanted for them? My own problem was perhaps never to be answered. I brought trailing after me, into my homeland, full memories of the West; my languages give me immediate access to the streams of world thought; I have been in many countries, and have the feel of them. In a sense my homeland was my last luxury. I could not be severed from the contact with English, French and German writers and thinkers. But I already know of thousands of young people here, in Palestine, to whom an additional language is a luxury; Hebrew with them is natural and complete; it is their armor, but it is also a barrier. The world reaches them—I mean the worth-while world—slowly and imperfectly, by translation. They are healthy, of course. The dual and multiple personalities of the exile Jew, the feeling of distress and of secondary acquisition, are unknown to them. But it is not easy for one who is a cosmopolitan Jew, an

international Jew, to imagine his children otherwise without some bewilderment. That my children would be different from me, and to some extent as alien to my questionings and evolution, as was the case between myself and my parents, was obvious. That hurt *me*. Yet that was hardly the point. If they were being given the chance to be whole, I had to forego certain intimacies. But suppose they would develop a forlorn localism of spirit, hedged in by the technical insufficiencies of the situation?

I wanted to weigh the loss against the gain. I wanted to know if it was a loss at all. Cannot life be full and strong in this intense miniature world, Palestine? Surely so, or else my belief that the Jews were building a new world center of human experiment was only a wilful illusion. Will my children miss the feeling of international adaptiveness, if not of ease? Or was it my error, the result of my own distorted outlook, which made me shrink at first, as one shrinks from a cold plunge, from the prospect of children rooted, unproblematic, and heart-whole?

And again: perhaps the solution lay in a bilingual people—Hebrew and English. But why English? Because it is the Mandate language, and also a world language? And can one really tamper in this way with the inner structure of a people? Did I not always believe that health and balance of mind comes first, and that such health and balance could

be acquired only by naturalness? Hebrew was the language into which our character had poured itself; it also embodied to the largest extent the curve of our history. Why should we not throw ourselves wholly, cleanly into it?

I had not answered this problem. It was one of the things that occupied my mind during the first quiet weeks in Tel Aviv, side by side with literary tasks that had hardly any connection with the country. With this problem others were connected. What was going to happen during the interim period of our cultural rooting? The first blossom of an authentic poetry is here, in the country. But it is not a poetry of Palestine: *it is a poetry of coming to Palestine*. However, it is organically Jewish, and it does not deal with the problems of other peoples taken up by the Jewish sojourner in their midst. What of the theatre? I knew only the Habimah, which I had seen in New York, and later, when I saw the Ohel, I knew that here too a true beginning was made. But I had dabbled in complete, even declining, cultures. Should I turn over my children to a groping, developing culture, or, rather, to a culture which was old in content and force, but was struggling for new expression?

And here again I argued from the other side too. Perhaps there was a corruption in my mind. I had come to the completed cultures of other peoples.

Better and healthier for my children to struggle awkwardly, with the rest of Jewish Palestine, toward new forms for their old heritage, till they had fused the powerful past into the present, rather than experience my own sense of invalidity. And perhaps, again (I felt this strongly) this experimenting of a highly intellectual people was really the latest need of the world.

I saw the Ohel (Tent) give its stage version of Stefan Zweig's Jeremiah. I can hardly remember having been so deeply moved by a dramatic work. These boys and girls, who are actors and stage carpenters and daily laborers, turn to the drama as people turned to it of old: with a fierce religious need. I am not speaking now of the biblical theme of the play, though, as it happened, nothing could have lent itself more naturally to their mood and manner. I am speaking of their loving carefulness and respect. It was as though they had prepared themselves by meditation, as well as by labor. They brought out of their inner selves an inherited memory of content: the primitive material at their disposal (they bought it with piastres they collected and donated) glowed with their spirit. I saw without the offence which it usually rouses in me an extreme modernness of form wedded by sincerity to a perfect fitting tradition. In the Habimah I thought the attempt a failure, a forced union of alien ele-

ments, angular symbolism, mythology, self-consciousness and exhibitionism. Here I saw the intent charge the form with new significance. The poverty of material resources, when remembered at all, heightened the effect by suggesting the will power that overcame it. The stage-craft was borrowed; so were the ingenuities. But here I saw how cultural values can be assimilated and re-created. The product was of Palestine. That is, it bespoke our traditions, new and old. It was true to the spirit of our desire, to our circumstances and our men and women, in short, to the character of this emergent little world.

All this I saw and felt, then asked myself: "Is it better to have such performances only two or three times a year, rather than the choice of many productions, most of them meretricious and degrading?" I was inclined to answer, Yes. But then, I had had my surfeit of the spoiled cities and their ingenious craftsmanship. And I was somewhat dishonest in that I was not cut off from them forever. What of those that will grow up in Palestine? Perhaps this stern and bare power, which affects me so deeply, can only follow surfeit.

Not that even in Tel Aviv there is a lack of imported rubbish, nauseating films, occasional local attempts that lack all sincerity. But here I was, operating with the memory of a large world, prescribing

for my children something which I had not tried. Was I being just to them?

These are only the beginnings of the problems which rose as the weeks passed. There are others, simpler, but not less urgent. I have come to Palestine and am not of it economically. I can hardly see my way toward my integration with this organism. I write for other countries. I lecture regularly in other countries. My children will have to be part of this world wholly, materially and spiritually. Was I giving them a fair chance in life? Was not this meagre world a setback, seen from the viewpoint of my opportunities? If I was satisfied that I had done well for them spiritually and intellectually by giving them a whole life, would they, in later years, perhaps curse me for having brought them up far from the progressive, comfortable West? Suppose they would leave Palestine in discontent, and face a harder, more obstinate problem of adaptation than I, who had been born into the principle of adaptation?

Suppose, finally, that I had read myself into them, and they had never meant to grow up (to put it thus) into tormented Jews, but could have lived snugly and happily wherever they chanced to be. What business had I to prejudge their characters and mould their lives in advance?

These questions may sound remote to those who have not become involved in the difficult process.

But they were and are real to me. And these questions, along with others, I meditated with new anxiety now that I had taken the irrevocable step. I consider them part of the inner Jewish revolution. I want to have them out with myself in part because they symbolize the revolution, and in part because many others must be concerned with them.

There was finally a personal problem which is also general. For much longer than I cared I had been engaged in Jewish politics. I am not politically inclined in action. I do not care to make orations, though I have liked lecturing. Also I believe public action to be so intricate and difficult a science, while political activity is so primitive and false, that the strain between the two was painful for me. I had felt myself impelled toward public work of this kind by a feeling of duty. When I withdrew from it for a couple of years I was distressed, as though I had laid down an unpleasant but necessary task. But I revolted against the view that I *had* to be forever an active Zionist. Was there no way of being a contributing Jew, as it were, without being involved in the harassing and irritating and—for me—unnatural labor of resolutions, collections, negotiations, organizations, demonstrations, with all the silly gestures and pomposities that are apparently not to be divorced from public life? I wanted to be a Jewish citizen doing a proper share of work in his own pri-

vate way. It was impossible outside of Palestine. Once I let go of my public work I lost contact with Palestine, and with what I considered the only living force in Jewish life. During the few years which passed between my withdrawal and our removal to Palestine I felt myself uprooted.

Here in Palestine, I hoped, I might come fairly near my desire. To be Jewish without working at it, in every sense of that word; to occupy myself with whatever took my fancy without at once severing my ties with my people. Of course I could not hope for perfection. I should have to write in Hebrew for that; I should have to bring into all my enterprises the weight of a full Palestinian Jewish upbringing. That far I could never get. The division of the exile would remain with me even in Palestine. But I should have brought it then as far as *I* could bring it. And my children, if they had to face a problem of this kind, would face it more serenely than I.

In the midst of these problems, which were fascinating and instructive, I felt a certain peace. For I knew that I was grappling with no false and shallow questions, the destruction of one set of conventions, the ultimate setting up of another. It seemed to me that I was examining human foundations: culture, psychological wholeness, self-expression, the relation between a man and his people and the relation of both to the world. These are not trivial things.

And I was examining them under circumstances which rendered me specially sensitive, and perhaps apt to strike on certain truths. This was not a matter of declarations, organization, membership, funds, etc.—the things that had occupied me for years. It meant observation of human beings, the deduction of laws for myself and perhaps for others.

I was done, I thought, with political Jewish activity, except insofar as every occupation with Jewish problems, even cultural and psychological, has a sort of political implication. I would no longer be engaged in rousing people to action (a task which may be necessary, but for which I have no natural inclination) but I might instead succeed in seducing them to thought. This, though more difficult, and less demonstrable, has a peculiar and perhaps dangerous fascination for me. I may be least fitted for what I like most. But at any rate I felt in this a return to my natural self. And this corrosive difficulty of being natural and at the same time Jewish, was dissolving in Palestine. It will never dissolve wholly, for me. But it will become less and less irritating, I think, with the passage of time. And this gave me a certain happiness.

CHAPTER II

Group Problems

GENTILE friends, American, English, French, have been astonished by my preoccupation with Jewish nationalism. They did not believe in nationalism of any kind: or, as they put it, "The question never even bothers us." It was hard to make them understand that it did not bother them because it was a healthy and tacit part of their system. In their serene relationship to their own people and their own culture, they mistook themselves for unrooted persons, belonging to the world at large. Of course they belonged to the world, as I hope Palestine will belong to it. But they did not know that their friendliness to all other peoples derived its naturalness from their personal group culture. But though it was difficult to make them feel my personal problems, they were often fascinated by the group problems of Palestine.

I have often heard Palestine spoken of as a centre of a new-old Jewish culture by Jews who did not realize that the phrase *new-old* is not static. They spoke of "the Law going forth from Zion," of "social justice" and of a "reawakened soul," when they

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

were incapable of realizing anything more exciting or disturbing than the humdrum decency of a Hebrew Borough Park, or Maida Vale or Charlottenburg. I am afraid of the growing influence of such Jews in the rebuilding of Palestine before they have experienced their own revolution. Yet it is absurd to think of keeping such Jews at a distance. Palestine has a double meaning. It has a meaning in itself, and it has a meaning for the Jewish world everywhere. It will, I hope, set free among world Jewry a frozen instinct for free thinking and free creation. It was therefore desirable and inevitable that, as the practical extension of Zionist work carried it beyond the control of the first Zionists (who were of course revolutionaries) a popular interest should arise, with all the dangers of popularization. The people who were shocked or irritated by the absurd unrealism of the Lovers of Zion of forty years ago, and by the baffling daring of Theodor Herzl (they thought, when he was engaged in creating something out of nothing, that he was only a prestidigitator) were bound to be interested as soon as the situation came within the scope of their outlook. But I wanted them to reach Zionism, rather than have Zionism reach them.

I am not now speaking of the Jewish Agency, which represents the union of all Jewish forces, Zionist and non-Zionist, in the upbuilding of Pales-

tine. The Jewish Agency, which many Zionists foolishly decry as the cause of the intellectual decline of Zionism, would have been impossible if Zionist work, and the Zionist movement, had not themselves changed in character. With that change in character the Jewish Agency became an historic inevitability. But that change in character, too, was inevitable. You cannot, as Herzl discovered (and as all great figures before him have discovered) revolutionize a people. The best you can hope for is to keep alive a revolutionary group, which passes from idea to idea, keeping the central aliveness of thought awake, while the people in the mass moves after it slowly. It is childish to inveigh against this process.

Large numbers of Jews had already entered the Zionist Organization who did not understand the implication of a "reborn culture." These Jews were quite of the same type, in general, as those who came into the work with the Jewish Agency. The truth is, that out of the Jewish Agency will also come Zionists more authentic than many of those who now belong to the Zionist Organization proper. For intellectual experience does not observe the limitations of an organization.

A culture, old or new or reborn, finds its last expression in literature and art. But its foundations are the conditions of life. "Social justice" is a phrase popular among Zionists: but the actuality may mean

something repugnant to the capitalistic and middle-class habits of many of them. Some Zionists thought of a "new old" culture in the form of excessive attention to mediæval Jewish orthodoxy. Others thought of a snug little Jewish state where they would be able to exercise the functions of *Jewish* statesmanship—whatever that may mean. Others thought of Palestine negatively, merely as the place where Jews would ultimately be safe, or, if not safe, would be able to fight honorably on their own soil. This is not a small matter, but it does not represent the *new* in Zionism. Others again, did not think much one way or another, but were driven by decency, affection, a vague sense of duty, to help along in something which they perceived at last to be a good piece of practical work.

It had always seemed to me that the Jewish working class of Palestine had most nearly preserved intact the original spirit of the movement. It is an astonishing circumstance that it is the Jewish working class of Palestine which incorporates most completely the will to a new *intellectual* effort. Among other classes the will is sporadic: here it is solid. The strongest bulwark of the Hebrew language in Palestine (I am not forgetting important exceptions) is the working class. In particular it is that part of the working class which has gone on the soil. The first efforts at a Palestinian Jewish art came

from it. The Ohel is drawn wholly from it. Painters and poets are close to it in their sympathies. The young men and women who came out of the exile to work on the land—in itself a difficult personal revolution—also submitted, simultaneously, to the fearful mental and nervous strain of the conquest of a language. They had to conquer it from within. The surrounding language was not Hebrew but Arabic. Their own language might be Yiddish, German or Russian. And while they almost broke their bodies in physical enterprises which were considered beyond the endurance of Palestinian natives, they underwent a grinding mental discipline. Our worker colonies are Hebrew, while our cities are *becoming* Hebrew. Petach Tikvah, a wholly middle-class colony, is still half Yiddish. This curious inversion has another parallel. While in Russia the cities are socialistic, and the country is individualistic, in Palestine the cities are middle class, the country is strongly tinged with socialism. Or perhaps the word "socialism" is misleading. I should perhaps say that in Palestine the colonies have a stronger sense of social idealism in practice. But both among the land workers and the city workers who are with them, the pressure of the new Zionist situation is being felt. In 1925-1926 Palestine suffered a severe economic crisis. Some say it was not a real economic crisis: the basic economic structure of the Jewish settlement remained sound,

only there was an impossible influx of workers who, when certain booms were over, found no means of integrating themselves with the structure. However that be, it was a time of profound torment for the workers; for on top of the privations which they suffered with all the others, they also witnessed the receding of their dreams. It had been a difficult business, this founding of a language side by side with the founding of colonies. It meant the harrowing of men's souls, as well as the harrowing of the soil. The Zionist middle classes throughout the world, startled by the situation in Palestine, clamored for economy and retrenchment, and for the discard of many forms of work which had enabled the workers to carry forward their double task. At the fifteenth Zionist Congress, held in Basle in 1927, we were compelled (I say we because I saw no way out of the difficulty at the time, and acted with the middle class) to give a setback to the movement of the workers in Palestine; and they tasted then the bitterness of an idealistic defeat, less bearable than physical want.

The character of these men and women should also be understood, for it puts the stamp on their collective significance in the rebuilding of Palestine. The leaders of the labor movement are intellectuals in a peculiar sense: actual members of the working class who constitute an aristocracy of culture and intelligence. The working classes themselves are heav-

ily loaded with men who have received a good European education. It was a furious moral as well as national impulse which drove them to Palestine. They wanted to rebuild life, no less than their own lives. To them a "new-old culture" meant the wholeness of their lives and of the Jewish life of Palestine. The Jews who accuse them of unreality, must remember that we are operating now on foundations which they laid: foundations which no one else was prepared to lay. I record the fact that middle-class Jewish Petach Tikvah has created and maintains a solid Arab settlement of three to four thousand souls *at their original Asiatic level of living*. But collectivist Dagania and Kfar Gileadi and Ain Charod and others have laid the foundations of an authentic Jewish peasantry. I must say peasantry because there is no other word; but now the word must be voided of its neolithic content. We must not think of the crushed, earth-bound slaves of the soil when speaking of Palestinian Jewish peasants.

These men and women combined, in their Palestinian impulses, obstinacy, daring and intelligence. We shall see soon, when I speak of the last assault by Arab mobs on the Jewish homeland, that the most dangerous strategic points in the country are nearly always occupied by *kvuzoth*—or co-operative groups. In Upper Galilee, in the Jordan valley and in the Emek Jezreel, the groups are stationed where the

danger is greatest. Some chose their posts deliberately: all accepted them in the consciousness of danger. I will not for a moment suggest an inferior degree of courage in other colonies. The defence of Ber Tuvia would contradict at once such a suggestion. But I do suggest in general a superior far-sightedness of courage. The co-operative groups, again, were founded by young people still without families, and responsible, therefore, only for their own lives. They have children now, but the tradition has remained.

But when I came to settle in Palestine I was not concerned with the question of an armed assault. I felt deeply the moral difficulties with which the workers of Palestine were struggling. I was wondering whether they had not suffered a permanent defeat during the last painful years. In a purely human way their disappointments (in many places still unacknowledged) presented a tragedy. It looked as though Palestine, preparing now for the second large influx of settlers, was coming under the influence of a different level of Jewish thought. Now the talk was of capital, of individual initiative, with many of the slogans of the West, where Capitalism is so deeply entrenched in the systems of countries, that it cannot be dug out without a fearful revolution: cannot be dug out at all, in fact, for such a revolution would destroy the actual foundations of society. But *they*

had come to Palestine as to a country where all was new: they could build well without the bloodshed and hatreds of revolution. And they were faced now by a change of front in the Jewish world, which, accepting the fact of a Jewish homeland, seemed prepared to remodel it on the lines of the life of the West.

With this question I occupied myself, too, while I was thinking of my own personal problems. I cannot define myself as a socialist, for I have a hatred of systems of any kind when applied to the fluid elements of life. But I have also a hatred of the moral consequences of the free-for-all fight which goes under the name of Capitalism. I have a hatred, too, of the worship of individual worldly success, of the mad exaltation of the ability to "get along," "advance one's self," "improve one's condition," and of its domination of the mind of the Western youth. The capitalistic world (for want of a better description) lifts to high moral eminence those virtues which are merely instruments of survival, and not the substance of a good life. And it punishes with contempt that which is sufficient punishment in itself, poverty and worldly incapacity.

It would be futile and stupid, I repeat, to talk of the exclusion of capital from Palestine: but was there no hope of excluding the capitalist psychology from the country? This is a bewildering problem, a new synthesis. I have already met in Palestine Jews who,

while they speak with proper awe of the success of the Western World, of America in particular, seem prepared to copy it in its worst as in its best particulars. There are already Jews in Palestine (they are very few) who confess an open contempt for social dreamers and idealists: Jews to whom Arab labor (on its serf level) is preferable to Jewish labor: Jews who repudiate angrily the suggestion that Palestine must present anything new in respect of social structure. Such Jews, I repeat, are an infinitesimal minority. Would they become a majority before long? I do not want to see Palestine built up in noble poverty, because poverty is destructive. I want the ability of the West, with as little as possible of its vulgarities and brutalities. And in this desire I felt myself now, as before, drawn to the Jewish workers of Palestine.

I set down all this as a preface to a description of the assault on the Jews in order that the reader may remember what it is that the Jews are doing in Palestine, and what classes of people are involved in the work. I have spoken chiefly of the workers of Palestine partly because they are nearest to me, and partly because they still represent the dominant element in the country. But *no* Jews have been coming to Palestine attracted by the hope of wealth. Among all classes, whatever their idealogy, the final deciding element was idealistic.

I hope some day to render into English that sombre epic of the return, *Masada,* by the Hebrew poet Isaac Lamdan. Under the name of the rock-fortress where a handful of Jews made their last hopeless stand against Rome, Lamdan describes the flight of the Jewish youth from the destruction of the West to the last citadel of Jewish possibility. Palestine is to him the gathering place for those desperate spirits who will not permit the Jewish heritage to be overwhelmed by the blind brutality of the hostile world. Let the reader remember that the young poets of Palestine were mostly participants in the struggle, were workers in colonies, differing from their comrades in their ability to express themselves, but not in their desire to give themselves.

And I—
While my crumbling soul yet held together,
I girded myself with the last of my strength,
And fled in the dead of night to the ship of the exiles
Going up to Masada.

They told me:
There the last flag of rebellion waves;
From heaven and earth, to God and man, the word:
"Recompense!"
On the tables of the rocks obstinate finger-nails clawing
Have graved the tidings of consolation
Against the hostile destiny of generations. . . .

They told me:
Among the walls of Masada the prophets go
Prophesying redemption.
And in the tents between the ramparts bands of Levites
Sing to victory.
And the echo of the morrow answers them:
"Amen!"

They told me:
On the heads of the fighters
The spirit which rains down atonement has now descended:
And across the veil of things to come stares the great eye of dawn,
And watches over Masada.

In this spirit the young Jews came to Palestine. They had—a great many of them—seen too much of the stupidity of war to believe in physical conquest. They transposed the language of heroism into peaceful endurance, and their dream was to make a place for the spirit of Jewry—as they interpreted it—by the conquest of material obstacles, opposing to the inertia of a neglected country, a ruined soil and a decayed people the more powerful momentum of their youth. They were unafraid and unaggressive. They were prepared to meet all aggression and offer none. Their one desire was to drown out the horrors of the war years in a return to something

which most of the world had forgotten, the pure will to creation.

When I came to Palestine it was my intention to study among other things the progress of this campaign against intractable physical and moral elements. Another poet, Uri Zwi Greenberg, has recorded in *A Vision of One of the Legions* the despair of the years of the crisis, when it seemed that sheer hunger would crush the working classes of Palestine. And he compares poignantly the passion of their first dreams with the disillusionment which threatened them.

> The vision of one of the legions,
> When disaster came down on the homeland
> And despair sent up a mist
> Before the wall of Jerusalem . . .

He tells the story of the early delight of sacrifice:

> And I say: I will turn wanderer
> Going from place to place like the Bedouin,
> And passing from door to door, I will sing
> The tale of the fate of a love.
>
> Like the new-born splendor in Nissan,
> Like the singing of snow when it melts
> And flows down the runlets in Nissan,
> Love went up in our hearts.
>
> In a sunburst of love we went up,
> Boys and girls to Zion,
> Vehement faith from the roots of our hair
> To the tips of the nails of our feet.

And this love without bound
To the mother earth of the Jew
Agonies could not quench
Nor the teeth of the foxes destroy. . . .

Had they commanded: Transform
The sea into soil of freedom!
We would have obeyed the command,
And done with the sea what we did with the
marsh.

What they did with the marsh and the wilderness I shall tell elsewhere, when I come to speak of the colonies of the Valley of Jezreel. For it is proper that the reader should know not only the nature of the recent assault on the Jewish settlement, but the nature of that which hatred seeks to destroy. I do not wish to offer here a record of attacks on Jews. They are the commonplaces of Jewish history. I want the reader, Jewish or non-Jewish, to know *what* is at stake in Palestine.

The reader must not confound the events in Palestine during August, 1929, with the rest of the disasters which visit us from time to time in various parts of the world. He must see the assault in terms of Zionism, and of the whole power of the movement. It is for this reason that I have chosen not to give a bald narrative, such as might be put together from newspaper and other reports: but rather to tell of these things against the background of a

continuous description of our position and desires. I have permitted myself only one prejudice: a profound belief in the decency of the Jews who have come to Palestine, and in their anxiety to build a new world without the oppression of those who occupy the territory in part. Granted this one weakness, I shall be found, I believe, to have scrutinized my facts carefully, to have set them down only after discounting even my prejudice. As to that prejudice itself, I can offer only a circumstantial defence. I know, for myself, what the Jews of Palestine are engaged in: I know, for myself, the Jews who have taken part in the work throughout America and in many parts of Europe. I also know that this is not evidence. But since every man must enter for himself into the hearts of others, and cannot accept the statements of a third party, I shall not waste much time in explaining my weakness.

CHAPTER III

Provocation and Connivance

FOR eight years the land had had rest. Since the riots of 1921 the Jews had been peacefully building in the country. Arab villages made money selling vegetables and fruit to Jerusalem and Tel Aviv and Haifa. Arab landowners made money by selling land to Jews, or became rich in equity by the raising of land values through Jewish enterprise. Arabs used the electricity brought in by the Jew Ruthenberg. Hadassah hospitals were open to Arabs as well as to the Jews. And there was a fair prospect that the early and natural suspicions of the Arabs, born of vague fear and of ignorance of the character of the newcomers, would be gradually eliminated.

There were occasional small local clashes: but they had nothing to do with the political situation. In vain the Arab Executive tried to instil in the Arab people a sense of approaching danger. The vast majority of the Arabs of Palestine are indifferent to politics. Those that had come in contact with the Jews had benefited. Those that had not come in contact with the Jews were occupied with their own

business. It was impossible to make a head against Jewish immigration into Palestine on political grounds.

I run the risk of being called partisan when I assert that the Arabs of Palestine do not constitute a nationality; but it is simple truth to state that Arabo-Palestinian nationalism does not exist. Egypt with its thirteen million Arabs is perhaps beginning to sense that corporate impulse, that feeling of a common spiritual destiny, which we understand under the name of nationalism. But in Egypt the process began nearly a century ago with Mehemet Ali, and it is difficult to judge whether even there it has reached an authentic stage. The day when Arabo-Palestinianism, as a nationality, will emerge into existence, will be a happy one for Jews and Arabs: for then the attention of the Arab people will be drawn to questions in which an understanding is easiest. They will not be at the mercy of chance currents of passion, and of the men who trade on them. The present trouble in Palestine illustrates this truth. For years a number of city Arabs tried to rouse a political resentment against the building of the Jewish homeland. They did not succeed because the Arabo-Palestinian nationalism which they banked on did not exist; and they banked on it falsely because if it existed—as it will some day—it would find strength in an alliance with the Jews. The superior

success of the last riots was due to a switching of tactics. Unable to waken a political revolt, Arab agitators turned to religious possibilities.

The game came into the open a year ago, with the Jewish High Holidays—the New Year and the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur). On the New Year the Jews brought into the Wailing Wall Place a portable linen screen, in a wooden frame, to divide off the male from the female worshipers. The division of the sexes during worship is one of the features of the orthodox services, but it was irregularly observed in the Wailing Wall Place, since there is no structure on the ground. A screen of this kind was used during the Turkish régime, and was used occasionally until six or seven years ago. For some time the practice had lapsed. On the two days of the New Year, 1928, it was revived. After the New Year services the screen was removed. It was not introduced again until the ten days between the New Year and the Day of Atonement had passed. On the eve of the Day of Atonement it was brought in again. It is not my business to judge of the value or the importance of the practice, since I have no feeling for it. But it does seem to me to have been an incident of the most trivial significance to anyone but a Jew. Yet the quick cunning of a few Arabs, and the curious behavior of at least one high British official created a "situation."

Mr. Keith-Roach, Governor of Jerusalem (his official title is: Deputy District Commissioner of Jerusalem), was visited by excited Arabs, who asserted that the Jews had launched an assault on Arab rights, and had upset the *status quo* of the Wailing Wall Place, by the introduction of a portable screen. They informed Mr. Keith-Roach that unless he would have it removed, a couple of hundred Arabs would go down and remove it. Mr. Keith-Roach, instead of advising the excited Arabs that he would not tolerate interference with Jewish worship on the most sacred day of the Jewish year, undertook to have the profanation officially committed. At the *Neilah* or closing service of the Day of Atonement he asked that the screen be removed. The beadle properly refused to do this until the Day of Atonement was over. Mr. Keith-Roach then sent an English police officer and some men to remove the screen by force.

The English police officer was neither intelligent nor reasonable, but one does not look for acumen and sensitiveness in police officers. He went down, broke into the midst of the worship, and removed the portable screen with much unnecessary violence.

I have been told who the ecstatic pietist was who suddenly decided that hitherto Jews had sinned at the Wailing Wall by not introducing a portable screen, but I have not bothered to record his name.

I repeat that when the Jews were told they should not have done it, they replied there and then that they would not do it again, but they would not brook the interference of police in the midst of their services. It seems to me that any administrator of intelligence and level-headedness would have calmed the Arabs by telling them that the matter would be rectified the next day: that the Jews would be specifically forbidden to put up screens again; that it was a stupid thing to ask for police interference on such a trifling matter; and that if they were going to make themselves obstreperous by their behavior, they would be promptly and firmly dealt with.

It is told on very high authority that a similar sort of threat was levelled once against Lord Plumer when he was High Commissioner of Palestine. The regimental colors of the Jewish troops who, as part of the British forces, had operated in Palestine during the war, were to be deposited with the appropriate ceremonies in the synagogue of the Hurva. Some Arabs called upon the High Commissioner, and advised him gravely that if the procession and demonstration were permitted, they, the Arabs, would not be responsible for the peace of Jerusalem. Lord Plumer's reply was: "No one asked you to be responsible for the peace of Jerusalem. As the High Commissioner I am responsible for it." And that ended the protest.

Mr. Keith-Roach dealt with the protest in the clumsy way I have recorded, and here the Wailing Wall "situation" was created. The whole of Palestinian as well as world Jewry, was shocked by the inept behavior of the Governor of Jerusalem. And suddenly the business of the building of a Jewish homeland seemed to center on this problem of whether or not Jews could introduce a portable screen into the Wailing Wall Place. The behavior of Mr. Keith-Roach dropped out of the picture. The gross misbehavior of the British police officer (he has since been transferred out of the country) also dropped out of the picture. And instead Arabs concentrated on raising a religious issue in the hope that they would fare better with it than with the political issue.

Among the cities of the world, Jerusalem is preeminent in stories of fanatical absurdities and hatreds. There are Christian sects who watch each other with implacable vigilance for the *inches* of ground they occupy in the Churches. I will re-emphasize the italicized word *"inches,"* by adding that I mean it literally. Blood has flowed for a foot shoved accidentally across the boundary. How can a modern person regard these ferocious hatreds (in Jerusalem, of all places!) except as part of the diseases of humanity, which enlightenment and good sense must cure? And what Jew wishes to see the Wailing Wall

become the center of controversies equally ludicrous and equally murderous?

The reader will now be given a little insight into the technique of spitefulness. But he must first form a picture of the topography of the scene. The Wailing Wall is a wall with one side: the other side is all filled up. On top of the wall level ground begins again—it is the Temple area of the Moslems, but until recently had no special significance. In front of the Wailing Wall (the reader must bear in mind continuously that there is no "back" of the Wailing Wall) there is a small oblong space. Here, for many, many centuries, Jews have congregated for prayer. To the Jewish mind, it is unquestionably the most sacred spot in the world. This little space is a *cul de sac,* or blind alley. One side is the Wailing Wall, and the three other sides are the lower walls of Arab houses (Church property, but not in any way religious). At one corner a narrow little street, passing through Arab property, enters the place of the Wailing Wall.

For hundreds of years no Moslem was ever concerned with the prayers of the Jews at the Wailing Wall. Neither the Wall itself, nor yet the immediate patch of Temple area at the top had special significance for Moslems. Although the property surrounding the Wall Place was Moslem, the custom of centuries had established the right of the Jews.

There *was* a prohibition against the Jews building anything in the Wailing Wall Place, but that had nothing to do with religious regulation, only with lay property rights.

No sooner had the Arabs learned how they could most effectively irritate the Jews, than they followed up the cue of the British Administration with a series of petty persecutions. Arabs began to pay special attention to the question; tiny near-riots broke out, and stones were thrown at Jewish worshipers. After the first quite intelligible outburst of Jewish resentment against the Palestine Administration, the larger section of Jewish opinion became calmer. But the most religious section of it on the one hand, and the least religious section on the other—a small part of the intransigent youth—gave special delight to the Arabs by failing to conceal their emotions.

It is my opinion that in this matter the Jews should have proceeded with unnatural patience. Not as a matter of justice, but as a matter of policy. But there was something peculiarly maddening in the dishonesty of the sudden Arab discovery that the top of the Wailing Wall was sacred to the memory of Mahomet's horse, El Burak, and that this (after they had ignored it for centuries) gave them a claim superior to that of the Jews to whom the place is sacred only by virtue of its connection with the Temple of the destroyed Jewish homeland. There

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

was something peculiarly maddening, too, in the thought that under the Turks no one had dreamed of raising the question, while under the administration of the British it was being raised very effectively.

To the prohibition against building in the Wailing Wall Place (and a portable screen was interpreted as building!) was added another defunct prohibition: that of sitting in the Wailing Wall Place. The Western reader is excused if he is inclined to be incredulous. But such is the truth. Jews were supposed to remain standing in front of the Wailing Wall, during the longest days of prayer! There are pictures extant which show the Jews sitting in front of the Wall, on chairs, during the Turkish régime. But the Arabs argue that this revolutionary and subversive privilege was obtained by bribing Turkish politicians.

The story is not yet ended. In July, 1929, the Arabs began to convert the blind alley of the Wailing Wall Place into a thoroughfare by building a door into one of the houses which enclose the place. Worship before the Wall could thus be interrupted, and *was* interrupted, by Arabs who passed that way at every hour.

I find myself repeatedly inclined to apologize to the reader for intruding on his attention all these absurdities, when I am dealing with the large and

earnest theme of the rebuilding of a Jewish homeland. But at this point I must add that if these absurdities suddenly began to overshadow the Jewish homeland itself, we must blame not only the savage pettiness of some Arabs, but the consistent incapacity or malevolence of British officials. When the Jewish authorities protested to the British administration that this conversion of the Wailing Wall Place into a public thoroughfare was indefensible, the administration replied that it would have the door closed during hours of worship, which is equivalent to saying that push-cart pedlars will not be permitted to sell their wares in St. Peter's during services. The simile, strong as it may seem, is inadequate. For the Wailing Wall is *always* being visited by Jews from every part of the world, and prayers are being said at every hour of the day. The Jewish authorities pointed this out, but obtained no satisfaction.

A very high Zionist official has described the action of Mr. Keith-Roach in ordering the removal of the famous screen last Yom Kippur very simply and accurately: he said that the police acted as if someone had shoved a kiosk into the middle of a street, and there was nothing to do but remove it. All consideration of the sanctity of the place, and the occasion, was forgotten. It was in a similar spirit of incomprehension (or was it in a worse spirit of com-

prehension?) that the Administration answered the protests of the Jews with the assurance that the public thoroughfare across the Wailing Wall Place would be closed during services. It was in a similar spirit, again, that the Administration observed the progress of the controversy.

On the afternoon of Tisha b'Ab (the Black Fast, in memory of the Destruction of the first and second Jewish Temples), August 15, 1929, between two and three hundred Jewish boys and girls assembled at one of the schools in Jerusalem and organized a procession to the Wailing Wall, to read there the resolutions adopted in Tel Aviv the night before (concerning infringements on Jewish rights of worship), and then to proceed to the Government house to submit these to the British authorities. The Government knew of this procession. The organizers were notified that the procession to the Wailing Wall was not opposed, also that their delegates would be received at 3.30 p.m. by the Acting General Secretary. The procession was heavily guarded by mounted and unmounted police. At the Wailing Wall the demonstrators read and explained the resolutions of protest against the Wailing Wall situation, the police being present as spectators. A Jewish flag was unfolded at the Wailing Wall Place, and at other points along the line of march. From the Wailing Wall the procession went out through the David

Street and the Jaffa Gate and wound up at the cinema Zion, where it dispersed peacefully. There were no incidents, and no arrests.

The next day, Friday, August 16th, news spread throughout the city that following prayers a Moslem demonstration would be held near the Wailing Wall. The Government knew of this demonstration, too. The police took precautionary measures and cleared the alleys to the Wailing Wall of the Jewish beggars usually stationed there. The majority of the Jews who were at the Wailing Wall about that hour left. Three remained, one being the *shammas* (beadle). At about one o'clock a crowd of some two thousand Moslems poured toward the Wailing Wall. Numbers of them penetrated via the door which had been the subject of so much discussion, into the actual Place of the Wailing Wall. Of the three Jews who had remained behind, two were saved by an Arab policeman. The beadle stood his ground. He was attacked and beaten by the crowd of Arabs. The table standing before the Wall was smashed. Prayer books were torn to pieces and then burned. The slips of paper bearing written prayers of Jews and inserted into the crevices of the wall, were torn out and also burned.

We can now examine an additional paragraph in the story of provocation on the side of Arabs and of connivance on the part of the Government. Until

my arrival in Palestine I had refused to form a too settled opinion on the rôle of the British administration in the country. And in this narrative I concentrate chiefly on incontrovertible material relating to events which occurred while I was in the country and could speak with many persons connected with the events. On August 17, the day following the Moslem desecration of the Wailing Wall, the government issued the following statement:

"Misleading reports are being circulated as to the events at the Wailing Wall on the 15th and 16th August. On the 15th August, during the Fast commemorating the Destruction of the Temple, in addition to the large number of Jews who proceeded in the ordinary way to the Wall to worship, some hundreds of young Jews exercised their right of access for purposes not confined to the usual practice of prayer but were associated with the making of a speech and the raising of a flag. At about 1 p.m. on the 16th August about two thousand Moslems left the Haram, where they had been celebrating the Prophet's birthday, and proceeded to the Wailing Wall through streets lying in the Abu Madian Waqf, which also includes the pavement in front of the Wall. A wooden table that was standing on the pavement was overturned by the pressure of the crowd and was broken, and papers containing pray-

ers and petitions lying in the crevices of the Wall were taken out and burned.

"Three Jews were at the Wall at the time of the Moslem visit, and reports to the effect that the worshipers at the Wall were assaulted are without foundation. The press reports, according to which the Moslems are stated to have broken into the Wailing Wall area from the south through a gate recently constructed, are equally without foundation.

"The situation at the Wall at the beginning of the Sabbath on the 16th instant was perfectly normal, and Jews were performing their Sabbath devotions there as usual.

"Government are now investigating offences that may have been committed in the events of both days with a view to ascertaining the possibility of identifying offenders for prosecution."

I must now impose on the reader a detailed examination of the above Government statement, for without such an examination it is impossible to understand the justice of the wide-spread complaint that the Government of Palestine, instead of acting with firmness and justice, seems to have adopted a rôle which resembles that of the *agent provocateur*.

First, as to the *language* of the statement. It is not less a strain on the English language than on the patience of the Jews to speak of a Moslem "visit" to the Wailing Wall. Again: "A wooden table that

was standing on the pavement was overturned by the pressure of the crowd and was broken. . . ." What a curious and evasive way of saying that the crowd smashed the table during its "visit." I suppose that only a notion of elementary physics prevented the Government from adding that the "prayers and petitions lying in the crevices of the Wall were ignited by the friction of so many bodies." And in speaking of the "Abu Madian Waqf, which also includes the pavement in front of the Wall," the Government seems to imply that Moslems can do whatever they like with it.

Here, however, I shall quote the protest of the Jewish authorities (the Zionist Executive, the Vaad Leumi or Jewish National Council of Palestine, the Chief Rabbinate and the Agudath Israel or Sephardic Jewish Community). The formulated protest, following an interview of the representatives of the above bodies with Acting High Commissioner Mr. Luke, is signed by the Zionist Executive, a body which is frequently criticized for its extreme reserve and caution:

"We protested against the Government having permitted a procession of a large body of Moslems to the Western Wall and a Moslem demonstration to be held there at all. The Government clearly knew beforehand of the intended demonstration as is sufficiently shown by their sending police to clear the

place. The effect of allowing such a demonstration is in the first place a complete reversal of the doctrine of the *status quo,* in which it has never been and cannot be suggested that the Moslems have either equal rights with the Jews, or indeed any rights whatsoever, to assemble in large force on the Western Wall Pavement or to make political demonstrations there. It also involved a breach of the assurance recently given by the Government to the effect that no interference with or disturbance of the rights of Jewish worship at the Western Wall would be permitted.

"We also protested against the insufficiency of the police on the Pavement at the time of the demonstration. There was nothing like the same number of police at the Western Wall on Friday morning, in order to control some thousands of Moslems demonstrating at the place of worship of another religion, as there was on the previous day in order to control a crowd of a few hundred youths demonstrating at their own place of worship. The natural and actual effect was that one person was assaulted and had repeatedly to be rescued by the police, that two perfectly peaceful worshipers who had every right to remain at the place had to be spirited away by the police lest worse should befall them, and that desecrations took place which the police seem to have been powerless to prevent. It seems hardly necessary to add that these results, which ought to have

been—if they were not—foreseen, were not only a breach of the assurances of the Government but were a breach of the law.

"We also ventured to point out that whilst we deprecated any attempt at exaggeration that may have appeared in the press or elsewhere, yet we could not regard the official statement issued by the Government on the 17th August as satisfactory. That statement suggests, in the first place, that while it is exceptional, if not positively unlawful, for Jews to go to the Western Wall for any purpose 'other than the usual practice of prayer'—even if that purpose be to protest in respect of complaint connected with the Western Wall itself,—yet, on the other hand, Moslems are entitled to come in their thousands for any purpose whatsoever to the Western Wall. The allegation or innuendo that the very Pavement is an integral part of the adjoining or surrounding Waqf, carrying with it presumably all the ordinary rights of full and unencumbered private ownership, is a new view which we feel bound to repudiate as being contrary to fact, to immemorial usage, to the terms of the Mandate and to the fundamentals of the Government doctrine of the *status quo*. Next the statement is careful to note that at the time of the 'visit'—as it is euphemistically called—there were only three Jews present and states that none of them was assaulted; but it omits the fact

that some fifteen worshipers had left immediately prior to the 'visit' either through the persuasion of the police or through their own apprehensions, and that of the three persons who remained, two escaped injury thanks to their being secreted by the police, whilst the third admittedly had at least his clothes torn and had twice to be rescued by the police. As to the question whether the new gate was or was not used, we need only say that the information at our disposal, derived from a number of eye-witnesses, is quite definitely to the effect that this means of access was used by a number of demonstrators. With regard to the situation at the beginning of the Sabbath on the 16th August, it is true that the peace was preserved by the police, but for a continual time the regular prayers were gravely interfered with by a continual succession of Arabs who passed and repassed over the Pavement, past the worshipers, using the new gate either as means of exit or ingress, until at the end, on our special representations, this freedom of passage was entirely stopped. . . .

"Your Excellency will have noted from the facts already stated by us above, that the very fears which we have repeatedly expressed to Your Excellency in relation to the opening of the new gate have been realized with remarkable rapidity and before even the new structural alterations have been completed. . . ."

It is a sordid, pitiful business that is recorded above. It hardly seems necessary to point out that a faint glimmer of goodwill, or even of intellectual decency, on the part of the responsible Arabs, might have cleared the issue. But it is useless to appeal to agitators. Far otherwise is the case against the British Administration. 1. No responsible administrator would have acted as the Governor of Jerusalem did last Yom Kippur. He should have withstood Arab pressure, have censured the Jews for putting up the portable screen (if the putting up of the screen was illegal), and obtained from them a promise not to commit the heinous offence a second time. 2. A responsible British Administration should have forestalled the development of a religious controversy in a land where such controversies are peculiarly ferocious, by settling the problem at once. 3. The permission to turn the Place of the Wailing Wall into a thoroughfare by the building of the door, should not have been given. (The Government showed that it could close this door, at least during services.) 4. The Arab procession to the Wailing Wall—a unique incident in the story of the Place—should never have been permitted. 5. The weakness which impelled the Governor of Jerusalem to send police to the Place on Yom Kippur is indefensible; more indefensible is the offensive Government Bul-

letin which describes the events of the 15th and 16th of August last.

In Palestine, among careful, intelligent Jews, there is a strong, widespread impression (openly expressed, as the reader will see) that neither obtuseness nor simple malevolence explains the attitude of the Administration. Instead—and with good reason, as the foregoing has shown, and as subsequent material will demonstrate more conclusively—there is perceived a low but effective cunning, the use of a principle especially sacred to the Romans and always recommended to rulers in a strange country: Divide and Rule. It is strongly suspected and clearly asserted that British administrators in Palestine *do not care* for a complete rapprochement between Jews and Arabs; that the temptation to strengthen their own position by keeping two peoples at loggerheads lies behind the otherwise incomprehensible refusal to act quickly and firmly when a disputed point, imbecilic in itself, is seized upon by agitators for the rousing of antagonisms and fears. To some readers this explanation will appear too simple. But I must repeat that the foregoing incidents are easily susceptible of this explanation, and that subsequent acts of the Palestine Administration, which I shall record further on, seem to be susceptible of no other.

I have deliberately opened this book with a discussion of some of the personal and collective problems

which face Jews in Palestine, in order to intimate how ugly and irrelevant and absurd is this controversy of the Wailing Wall. The distraction of Jewish attention from economic and spiritual creation to the involved details of ritualistic privileges is a calamity to the Jews and to the country. It degrades the Zionist movement to the level of an obscure and impassioned monkish quarrel. It was not and is not desired by the Jews. Had the British Administration been as eager to avoid it, it would not have arisen.

CHAPTER IV

The Funeral Incident

BY this time (August 16-21) an extreme tension reigned in Palestine, and particularly in Jerusalem. Among the Arabs wild rumors were current that the Jews were contemplating an assault on the Holy Places of the Mohammedans. Frequent assaults on Jews took place in Jerusalem, and the situation had become alarming to everyone —except the British Administration. On Saturday, August 17, a young Sephardic Jew by the name of Abraham Mizrachi was stabbed by Arabs in Jerusalem, was taken to the Government hospital, and died there on the 20th. The British authorities demanded that he be buried secretly, at night. The horrified parents of the murdered boy refused their consent. Through the intervention of the Zionist Executive representatives, the funeral was arranged for Wednesday morning, August 21st.

Early that morning a crowd of Jews gathered in the Russian courtyard (by the hospital), and funeral orations were delivered. The crowd was restless and disturbed. Among the speakers there were some who used the occasion for political declarations, and

laid the death of Mizrachi variously to the policy of the British Government and of the Zionist Executive. Among the crowd, trying hard to produce an atmosphere of calm and discipline, were representatives of the Zionist Executive and of the Jewish National Council of Palestine. Between these and the Government an agreement had been reached, in accord with the parents, as to the route to be followed by the funeral procession. The Government had demanded at first that the procession be confined to back streets only. The Jewish representatives had insisted that, for decency's sake, the mourners should be permitted to go along *one* of the main streets. The accepted compromise was, that the funeral should proceed from the Government hospital along the Jaffa Road (a main street) then turn down to the left, at the Post Office, toward the Nablus Gate. The funeral left the hospital, at first under a guard of Arab mounted police. A cry rose from the mourners that they would not have an escort of Arabs at the funeral of a boy murdered by Arabs. The Arab police were withdrawn, and replaced by British police in automobiles.

When the procession emerged into the Jaffa Street, it was joined by throngs of Jews, till the total number following was around two thousand. At the Jaffa Road, by the Post Office, a double cordon of

police was drawn up, to prevent the procession from proceeding except along the prescribed route.

At this point the trouble began. A group of young people (the same type which had demonstrated before the Wailing Wall on August 15) began to urge the procession along the closed street. Some of them tried to break the cordon, and here the police reacted with extraordinary savagery. The crowd was not only turned back, but pursued for a distance by British and Arab policemen, who struck the *fleeing* mourners repeatedly. This is attested by the shocking fact that numbers had their wounds and bruises only on the back of their heads! An Arab policeman, Number 989, began to shout in Arabic, to his fellow-policemen, to come to the aid of the Arabs who were being attacked by Jews! Twenty-four persons were wounded, one seriously. Among the wounded were two old Jews above the age of sixty, and one woman of forty. The coffin bearers had to set down their burden and flee, leaving the dead boy in the middle of the street.

And now let us turn to the Government report of the incident, issued the next day.

"On the morning of August 21st, in Jerusalem, a number of irresponsible young men joined the funeral procession of Abraham Mizrachi who died in the Government hospital a day before as the result of wounds received August 17th. They tried to di-

vert the procession from its agreed route and to direct it to the Jaffa Gate. By order of the Government, the police prevented them from achieving their purpose. Twenty-four persons were lightly wounded, of whom twenty-three left the hospital the same day, while one remained for further care."

In connection with this incident the following proclamation was issued by the Jewish authorities:

"The members of the Zionist Executive, and the Committee of the Jewish National Council have been shocked by the new disaster which occurred today in Jerusalem. The funeral of Abraham Mizrachi, who was stabbed last Saturday, was transformed into a clash *(hitnagshut)*. Dozens of people were beaten. Many were wounded. Among them were old people who cannot be suspected of offering any resistance to the orders of the police. Among them are people who were beaten on the back of the head and the neck, when they fled from the scene of the fight, *i.e.*, obeyed the orders of the police and went in the direction demanded by them. Many people were beaten cruelly, and indiscriminately.

"The Zionist Executive and the Committee of the Jewish National Council assembled today with the representatives of the Chief Rabbinate and the Agudath Israel at an urgent meeting where it adopted certain resolutions.

"The representatives of the Zionist Executive and

of the Jewish National Council will negotiate today with the local Government and inform it of their attitude toward these incidents, will demand an investigation of the details, the punishment of the guilty and an assurance of peace and security to the Jewish population.

"The Zionist Executive is also in constant touch with London. The cable received from the Zionist Executive in London promises that the British home government appreciates properly the recent incidents in Jerusalem, and there is good reason to believe that the protection of the home government is assured us.

"The first, indispensable condition to successful action on our part is the patient preservation of national discipline. The Jewish population should remember that the solution of the Wailing Wall question will not be solved either by meetings and demonstrations or by separatist action. In this question, more than in any other, and at this time more than at any other, it is the duty of all to rally round the central institutions, and to give them the possibility of centralized and united action. Even those among the Zionists and the general population who oppose the methods of action adopted by the Zionist Executive and the National Council are called upon now for discipline and centralized action. The disgraceful fact that all the demands of the representatives of the Zionist organization and of the National

Council during the funeral did not influence the group of unruly people *(mitparzim)* among those who were attending the funeral, and that the explicit agreement on the order of the funeral procession was broken, was a disaster to us which must not be repeated. Those who instigate public opinion against centralized action, and those who pay heed to such propaganda are made responsible.

"In this earnest hour we turn to the Yishub (Jewish inhabitants). The struggle for our rights, and the defence of our honor and safety have impelled us to this declaration.

(Signed)

The Zionist Executive
The Committee of the Jewish
National Council."

The curious consistency in the attitude of the Government toward the Jews is again confirmed here. At all times (the screen incident, the desecration of the Wailing Wall Place, the Government report) the decent feelings of the Jews must be wounded in order that the indecent feeling of Arab mob leaders might be spared. The British authorities demanded first that the murdered Mizrachi be buried at night. When the parents refused this desecration of the dead, the authorities suggested that the funeral pass only through back streets. And when some irrespon-

sible boys tried to break through the cordon of the police, the latter turned on the Jews with a savagery which suggests a policy of *Schrecklichkeit* against wild natives. Every eyewitness insists that the police could have turned the procession down the right path with no violence. But this exaggerated firmness was for the Jews. Had the Government used one-half of it with the Arabs, much bloodshed might have been saved both Arabs and Jews in Palestine.

There is little wonder that a strong belief grew among the Arabs that the Government was "with them." We shall see further on that this belief was openly expressed in many ways.

On August 22nd the Arab paper *Falastin* wrote:

"In Jerusalem there is great excitement. The atmosphere is tense, *and it is apprehended that tomorrow (Friday, August 23rd) when many fellaheen assemble for prayers in Jerusalem a substantial answer will be given to these incidents.*"

The Government paid as little attention to the Arab as to the Jewish press.

CHAPTER V

The Riots in Tel Aviv

IT is impossible, from this point on, to follow a purely chronological order. Nor is it my purpose to give merely a recital of the events which have been described by the newspapers. I am concerned with something more than an outbreak of Arabs against Jews.

A few days after the outbreak of the riots, after the ghastly massacre in Hebron, and before the equally horrible but less wide-spread massacre in Safed, Musa Kazim Pasha, President of the Arab Executive of Palestine, sent the following cable to London: "The bloodshed in Palestine clearly shows that the policy applied here for ten years, involving spoliation of Arab rights, is dangerous to all concerned. Arabs after the great war lost all the political rights they enjoyed under Turkey and witnessed Jewish riff-raff being introduced from all parts to their country to build a non-existent nation. . . ."

I have no hope of influencing, in any degree, the author of this telegram. But I think I may be excused if, in describing the events in Palestine, I also describe the kind of people who are involved, the

things they think and say, and the work they are engaged in. It is not indifference to the sufferings of Jews elsewhere that makes me assert the significance of the attack on our work in Palestine. The murder of any Jew for being a Jew is a particular sort of crime, for the Jews have at least symbolized, in a turbulent world, the unarmed and unaggressive assertion of individuality. But the Jewish homeland besides representing a present hope to hundreds of thousands of persecuted Jews, embodies a creative principle of a rare kind. It bespeaks whatever international conscience yet exists, for it has had the sanction of all civilized nations. And it has attracted to itself a type of men and women who represent the best there is in our people. Even the persecuted Jew who looks for a haven of refuge in Palestine, knows that his hope of comparative safety lies in the development of high faculties of endurance and independence. And however I disagree with the outlook of many Jews concerning the manner in which Palestine should be built, the character of those who are willing to play the pioneer in this difficult country is, in the aggregate, beyond my criticism at least.

. . . . .

Tel Aviv is a composite city, with a character of its own. It has its workers, its middle class, its

professionals and its Yemenite Jews, but it is regarded as the most bourgeois city in Jewish Palestine. Now a bourgeois city of forty thousand is as a rule one of the least pleasant of human creations. But Tel Aviv is *sui generis*. For the bourgeoisie of Tel Aviv is drawn, on the whole, from a liberal and intellectual Jewry dotted through Europe. It has, roughly, a good bookshop for every two thousand inhabitants. The company one finds here would satisfy, in variety and level of culture, the most fastidious. The level of municipal politics is superior to the national politics of some countries; for here we have large numbers of men and women who actually understand and discuss principles. There is nothing provincial about the city. Built, organized, maintained by Jews, it is a good example of what Jews can do even without preparation. For it is a city built largely by amateurs.

There is poverty in Tel Aviv; a small proportion of it is grinding. But poor people don't think of themselves here as poor people. The spiritual degradation of poverty is almost unknown. There is no great wealth in Tel Aviv, and the rich people here (a person is rich who has an income of fifty to sixty dollars a week) do not form the closed and insolent clique which they form elsewhere in the world. I do not like to apply the cant word "democracy" to this situation: for it is something more.

It is a tacit understanding of individual human worth. It is a mental alertness which make impossible the solidification of social strata.

I do not wish to be unreal. Like every other city of any size Tel Aviv has its mistakes and its fools. That is to say, it is human. But, after having known a great many cities, I can say that nowhere is the good side of the human mind given as free a chance as here.

If there were any Arabo-phobia among the Jews of Palestine, if there were an aggressive spirit, a mob psychology, we should find it in Tel Aviv. For the city is wholly Jewish. The restraint of outside observers is lacking here. And Jews are more among themselves in Tel Aviv than anywhere else in Palestine, or in the world. Yet the mob spirit of hatred and defiance never developed before or during the riots. It is an astonishing truth that the resentment of Jews here was directed more against the incapacity of the Palestine administration—or its hostility—than against the Arabs. And that remains true until this day.

Tel Aviv is contiguous with Jaffa, and in some places the two cities run into one. Physically Tel Aviv is stronger, for it has a disproportionate element of youth, and a strong sprinkling of ex-soldiers of many armies of the great war. Had there been Jewish aggressiveness, this would have been the

place. Were there a mob spirit latent among Jews in Palestine, Tel Aviv would have developed it soonest. But Tel Aviv remained quiet even on the day of the big outburst in Jerusalem (Friday, August 23). No mob gathered. No assault on Jaffa was dreamt of, much less proposed.

On Friday afternoon, at about two-thirty, I came out of my working room on the quiet Bialik Street, and saw toward the end, at the corner of Allenby Road, an unusual commotion. I went up to investigate, and found knots of people gathered round small bulletins posted by the newspapers on the walls. The papers had already appeared. There was to be no other paper until Sunday. (Actually there were no more papers for more than a week, for they were suspended on Saturday by the Government.) And these bulletins carried the news of the Arab assault on the Jews of Jerusalem.

The bulletins, as it happened, understated the seriousness of the outbreak. But the news they contained was bad enough—fierce fighting in the streets of Jerusalem, and next to no interference on the part of the authorities. (I shall give fuller details on the Jerusalem chapter.) I hastened down the Nachlath Benyamin to the house of a friend, G., in the hope of getting more details. But it was impossible to speak with him, for he was already engaged in the organization of part of the self-

defence. People came and went, young boys stood about in knots, the house was in a turmoil. A feeling of unpreparedness pervaded the air. At about half past three the first British aeroplane appeared overhead, and the excitement was intensified, for if the British had thought of demonstrating above Tel Aviv and Jaffa, there was clearly a foreboding of trouble (at last!) even on its part.

I spent most of Saturday wandering about the city, in between attempts to attach myself to some self-defence group. Everybody was organizing for self-defence, but the Haganah, or semi-official self-defence, was proceeding systematically. On Saturday peaceful Tel Aviv presented a curious sight. Hundreds of people wandered up and down the main streets armed as for peasant warfare, with sticks, clubs and palings wrenched from the supports of the young trees on Allenby Road. It was a ridiculous as well as a pathetic sight, for no one knew what was happening, no one had any idea of where and how the fighting might begin, and no one seemed to understand that sticks and clubs were perfectly useless now. There was no fear anywhere: only excitement, bordering in some cases on hysteria.

The little square on which I live is, on the Sabbath, the quietest place in Tel Aviv. On one side, to the front, is the Iriah, or Municipality. On the opposite side begins Bialik Street. On this Saturday

the square was invaded—for the first time on a Sabbath, I think—by couriers on bicycles, motorcycles and automobiles. It looked at last like the municipality of a noisy little Western town.

News from Jerusalem came in all Saturday and was posted up in the newspaper bulletins. The news grew worse, but never actually reached the truth. Strangely enough, the Jews of Tel Aviv, in a reaction against themselves, discounted even the most conservative reports. And when late Saturday night there came the first rumors of the massacres at Motzah and Hebron, those that received them were cautious in spreading them, and the great majority refused to believe.

During Saturday afternoon G., in touch with the Haganah, organized a group of ex-soldiers to take over a certain section of the defence. Twenty-seven of us were enrolled, and most of the afternoon we hung around a district headquarters waiting impatiently for the assignment, and wondering what arms, if any, were available. Still the majority refused to believe that there would be any attack on Tel Aviv. "The position is too strong, the Arabs have exaggerated notions about our equipment," and so on.

Before we disbanded that evening, we had been organized into squads, and assigned to a post which we would learn of early next morning. We were to

reassemble at five a.m. at the local headquarters, and from there be led to our position.

I must confess that the great majority of us felt silly during the entire business. We were organizing secretly—for an official defence is illegal. We had to resort to schoolboy tricks and subterfuges. When we were led, early next morning, to our post, we had to go into a certain house by ones, casually, and assemble on one of the upper floors. To attract attention might be dangerous: not on account of the Arabs, but on account of the British, who were now arriving in small numbers, and had orders to arrest everyone with arms.

For the twenty-seven of us who assembled upstairs and kept a watch on Herzl Street, where it leaves Tel Aviv and goes over to the Moskobia, there were thirteen pistols of assorted makes, and twelve cartridges or so to each man. The others of us were unarmed, except for sticks. I had not even that, so the squad commander sent me home for something. I had, at home, the choice of a broomstick or a kitchen knife, and feeling equally absurd in the possession of either, I decided to take nothing at all.

It was then about twelve-thirty. What with the attempt to keep the children from knowing what I was looking for, and the amusement of the rest of the household, I thought that it might be

better for me to stay at home and not make a fool of myself joining empty-handed in the defence of a city which the Arab mob would surely never dare to attack. At that moment, as we stood on the doorstep, we saw approaching a friend of ours who lived near the sea. He was accompanied by his wife, and by their child. In their walk and looks was something unusual. They had come to ask for shelter. A large Arab procession had left the Mosque of Hassan Bek, in Jaffa, and was heading for Tel Aviv. The Jews were now being cleared out, by the Jewish self-defence, from the Nevei Shalom and the Ofek Ha-Yam quarters, where the Arab and Jewish houses mingle. The self-defence was ready for an attack.

The general hilarity was replaced by a curious mixture of disgust and irritation. The picture of myself rushing about a city looking for a stick to beat off Arab invaders, because there was not a reasonable weapon for me, was not so amusing now. My house stands next to the municipality and is therefore in the safest section of Tel Aviv. I saw that it would be absurd for me not to return to my post. I started back empty-handed, and on the way chanced on a carpenter's shop with a line of purchasers outside. I heard the hissing of a lathe and guessed what was going on. Clubs were being manufactured to order. I stood in line, and got one for

five piastres (twenty-five cents). The usual price would have been two piastres, but where there is war there are profiteers. I imagine this carpenter must have earned as much as ten dollars that day.

Now armed with a club, I rejoined my group. The end of Herzl Street was in a turmoil. A crowd of young people had gathered there and was watching a crowd of Arabs which assembled five hundred yards away in front of the Arab village round the Moskobia. The two crowds were watching each other for the first signs of hostility. Up on our perch we cursed the young people downstairs for not going home. We happened to forget that they had no idea that someone was already keeping guard on this section of the town; the Jewish self-defence was secret.

A few minutes after I had returned to the post, we heard shots, in front of us to the left. Now and again the Arab crowd made a move forward. A shot would be heard, and the Arab crowd withdrew. No one was touched. Either the shots were being fired by incredibly bad marksmen, or they were being fired in the air. At intervals of about half an hour a British armored car appeared, patrolled the streets and made the two crowds disperse. When the car disappeared, the crowds reappeared.

At about three o'clock, for some reason or other, both crowds had disappeared. Perhaps they had

been drawn to other parts of the town, where things were happening, or promised to happen. We sat up there, with a marvelous panorama at our feet. Immediately before us was open ground, then orange groves and palm-trees: and across, warm gray in the sunlight, the city of Jaffa. I was not the only one there who felt the tragedy and absurdity of the situation. Two little towns at war, staring at each other in mutual suspicion. It carried one back to the struggles between the communities of the Seven Hills, or the older enmity between Athens and Megara. It was an outrageous anachronism—at least to us, with our Western, European education. We talked a good deal, that afternoon, while we kept watch, of Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front.* (The Hebrew translation was out before I left Palestine.) Most of these men had served in the German and Austrian armies, others in the Russian and English (Palestinian) and American forces. And if the Great War had left all of us with a disgust for the heroic, this petty squabble in Palestine moved us to an even deeper loathing.

To complete the caricature, we could not help feeling that in this petty squabble (for such it was bound to appear to us) we did stand on the side of a principle. And the principle was symbolized for us there by the scene at our feet. On one side lay Tel Aviv, a city which had sprung up in twenty years

on empty and forbidding sands. A city that was modern in the least objectionable sense; peopled by men and women conscious of social and intellectual purposes. On the other side, Jaffa, a very ancient city, a city typical of the decayed East, with a few rich and many poor—and a poverty of that awful and indescribable type which can be found only in the East. There are men in Jaffa who live on ten or fifteen cents a day: they eat the flat, tasteless cakes—dried dough, really—which are sold off pushcarts; they sleep in the open; they gather their clothes off filth heaps. The standards we had brought into the country had benefited some of them. And our greatest problem is to have it benefit all of them: for there is only one way in which Jewish labor can establish itself soundly in Palestine, and that is by destroying the ancient tradition of human exploitation and lifting human beings back to a human level. On the one side Tel Aviv with its poets and painters and thinkers. On the other, backward Jaffa, in which education is a fantastic luxury, and modern intellectuality—in a levantinized form, at that—the possession of a handful. Only yesterday, too, we had got along so well. The young bloods of Jaffa used to come on Fridays (the Moslem Sabbath) to Tel Aviv. This was their taste of "Europe," of "the civilized world." They sat in the little cafés we have

SCHOOL OF THE

set up on the beach, opposite the Casino, and in the Casino. They came to our dances. And today, this idiotic and unreal feud, fanned into flame by evil men, and threatening the amity precariously built up in eight years of construction.

Throughout the whole afternoon shots were exchanged in front of us, from the Arab village and from the left of it. We did not know precisely where the next Jewish post was. Now and again somebody came from the city—where all the shops were now closed—and gave us vague news of fights in other sections. And we hoped that everything would pass peacefully in ours.

And then suddenly one of our men shouted and pointed along the road. At a distance of about five hundred yards a small group had emerged from behind an Arab house. At that distance, and in the strong sunlight, I could not distinguish what kind of people they were. But I made out one man on the ground, and two bending over him. The first thought was, that the man on the ground was being beaten by the other two.

At once the larger part of the post descended into the street—and now a fearful confusion ensued. As if by magic a crowd had gathered at the end of Herzl Street. There was a swift, loud rumor: "They are killing a Jew." The crowd surged forward. My group was lost. I went forward with the rest. As we

went down the road three figures passed us: a stout boy, streaming blood from several wounds, half carried, half dragged by his companions. (I surmise that this was young Benjamin Goldberg). His face was ghastly to look upon. A little further down the road a second, similar group passed us. And now we began to fear that a regular procession of wounded Jews would proceed from behind the Arab houses.

No one knew what had happened. No one knew where to look first for the wounded men. We guessed (accurately as it turned out) that a larger number had been wounded, and we wanted to bring them out. No soldiers, no police, were in sight. The sound of firing was now continuous, close at hand. We heard the whistle of bullets—they seemed to come from the orchards on either side, and from somewhere in front. Afterwards I learned that there was good reason for the quick gathering of a crowd here. The place had an evil name. It was within a hundred yards from the corner where we had first seen the wounded men, that Joseph Chaim Brenner, one of the most gifted Jewish writers of Palestine, was killed with his companions in 1921.

The crowd was not frightened, but it was bewildered. It was unled, it had no plans, and every man was for a strategy of his own. Small groups broke away and explored the little lanes on either side of the main road—though what they would have done

against a nest of armed Arabs it is difficult to tell. Suddenly, from the front, came a quicker fusillade of shots, followed by a lull. A group of us came back into the open road, wondering what had happened. I felt silly, and useless, and an obstruction, with the stick in my hand. I looked up toward the city, and saw a squad of soldiers advancing down the road. The others had seen it, too, and now everyone scattered. The men with the pistols moved fastest—for to be caught with one now might mean death. The soldiers came on, steadily, eight pale English boys, with rifles at the port, bayonets fixed. In front walked an officer, with a pistol in his hand. Behind them walked a second officer, pale, waving angrily at the Jews to get out of the line of fire, and shouting, in a very cultured voice: "Back, damn your souls, back!"

In about ten minutes we were back at our posts, and the street was cleared. Only later did I learn the preceding details of the story.

Late in the afternoon, news was brought into Tel Aviv that four Jewish workers were marooned in the Fuller alcohol factory, close to the spot from which we later saw the wounded figures emerge. A group of young Jews armed with pistols got into an automobile and went there. But before they reached the place a heavy fire from surrounding orchards and houses compelled them to stop. A crowd of

Arabs then assaulted them at close range, with firearms and daggers. Three men, Goldberg, Feingold and Berkowitch were very badly wounded. The others were more lightly wounded, stood up against the attack, and brought the heavily wounded through. Of the two wounded men I had seen carried down the road, I suppose, from description, that one had been Goldberg. I do not know who the second was, and I did not see the third. All three died shortly afterwards in the Hadassah Hospital of Tel Aviv.

Some hours before the killing of Goldberg and his companions Arab assaults had taken place in other parts of the city. The trouble began about the time when the Arab crowds left the mosques. But though it is true that the harangues in the mosques contributed toward setting off the mob, it is also true that the almost simultaneous attack on three sections of Tel Aviv bespeaks a pre-arranged plan. But if this is not sufficient evidence, there is the astounding statement of the Jaffa correspondent of the *Alif Beh,* a Damascus Arab paper. The correspondent writes, in the issue of September 1st:

"The arrival of 'H. M. S. Sussex' at Jaffa helped in the pacification of the town. This ship, starting out from Malta, travelled at the rate of 27 miles an hour, her rate usually being 17 miles. Imme-

diately upon her arrival, troops were disembarked, and they stood guard over Tel Aviv and Jaffa. As a result the Arabs were prevented from realizing their plans of marching against Tel Aviv, *as well as other plans which had been prepared in advance!"*

The firing in the section I have first described began at about one o'clock, though the killing of Goldberg and his friends did not take place until late in the afternoon. But the first outbreak was from the Mosque Massoudia toward the Ofek Ha-Yam quarter, where Jewish and Arab houses mingle. A Jewish carter by the name of Rosen was the first to be wounded, and round him a struggle developed. A British contingent came up before further casualties took place, and with a machine gun dispersed the Arabs.

A stronger attack took place near the Yemenite quarter. A crowd of Arabs broke through in the direction of the Machneh Brenner. But here they were halted by the Jewish self-defence, and held until military help arrived, and dispersed them. Along the main street of the Nevei Shalom (in the same vicinity) the fighting was much more continuous. The Arabs shot from the houses, and from behind the hedges along the lanes. The assault was carried out almost entirely with firearms. A military automobile could not do very much here. For the

Arabs hid whenever the machine appeared, and emerged again when it was gone. But here the resistance of the Jewish self-defence was particularly strong. The Jews stood at the entrance to every alley, and repeatedly threw back the attackers, who were unable to penetrate into any Jewish house. Several Jews were wounded at this point.

On the evening of Sunday, the shooting ceased. On Monday the British warships lay off Jaffa, and after that day there were no more attacks. But on Sunday afternoon a military proclamation appeared, ordering people off the streets after six p.m., closing the cafés after that hour, and forbidding all carrying of arms. (This is forbidden anyway.)

Sunday night Tel Aviv was quiet. Only a few scattered shots were heard in the night. I got home that evening before the curfew hour (we were relieved at our post by another group) and had until the next morning to meditate on the curious position of a Jewish city exposed to Arab attack and forbidden to possess a self-defence or firearms. Opposite my house the lights of the Iriah (city hall) blazed all night and machines came and went. My little girl asked me what those lights were doing up there so late. I answered: "They are having a meeting." "Then why don't we hear them shouting, like they always do?" was her next question. I said: "They are very serious now."

Curiously, that night I thought a great deal of the forty lunatics who usually wander through the streets of Tel Aviv—because we are still too poor to afford an asylum for them. With four of them I am familiar by sight. One appears at regular intervals before the Iriah, and shouts fierce denunciations, in Yiddish, against the municipality for not observing the Sabbath more closely. He always carries a Bible, from which he quotes. I have heard him rave in the heat of an August midday for more than half an hour at length. Two of them are shocking, half naked creatures. The fourth that I have seen was wholly naked. He was wandering, a weird figure, round the back of our house, when I perceived him. He is said to have been, at one time, an intelligent teacher. I kept wondering that night whether any of these pitiful creatures would be out, and would be shot, as orders threatened. But nothing happened to any of them.

Monday and Tuesday of that week I spent, with others of my squad, guarding various points in the city not covered by the British soldiers. We played hide and seek with them, for fear of being arrested with arms and put in prison. On Monday afternoon two Jews were wounded by shots fired from the orchards which had troubled us on Sunday. British soldiers arrived too late to help, but in time

to arrest four Arabs with arms. On Tuesday evening our group broke up. Other groups were breaking up, too. And among them were scattered fifteen boys of the Ohel Theatre whom I had seen, a week or two before, in that moving production of a great peace play—Jeremiah.

CHAPTER VI

Rousing the Arab Mob

I SHALL treat in this chapter of two things: the forewarnings which the British Administration had as to the coming trouble; and the methods used by Arab leaders, high and low, to rouse a mob spirit among the Arabs against the Jews. But these two subjects are not unconnected. An administration which ignores portents of trouble, invites it. And the British Administration in Palestine had done much to encourage among Arab mob leaders a belief that it was "on their side." There was its extraordinary weakness in dealing with Arab disorder and Arab demands; and there was its extraordinary intransigeance in dealing with Jewish demands. There was the prompt and brutal removal of the screen from the Wailing Wall on the Day of Atonement—and the refusal to prevent a door from being built into the place of the Wailing Wall. There was the heavy guard at the little Jewish demonstration before the Wailing Wall; there was the feeble guard at the big Arab demonstration before the same place. There was, on top of this, the abrupt and unreflecting ferocity of the police on the occasion of the

Jewish funeral. If by nothing more than these signs, the Arabs were justified in believing that the Palestine Administration was on the whole hostile to the Jews. A correspondent of the *Alif Beh,* the Arab paper of Damascus, wrote, shortly after the events in Palestine, that he interpreted the uprising to be a result of British intrigue. Britain, he believed, was anxious "to blunt the demands of the Zionists, which in Zürich had become too impudent." The English, in his opinion, were looking for an excuse to reject the demands of the Jewish Agency to participate in the administration of the country, and encouraged the Arabs to teach the Jews a lesson. But when the uprising occurred, he continued, it exceeded the bounds set by the English and became a general revolution against British policy in Palestine and Transjordania.

I do not take seriously the implication of the British home government. But there is in this article an instructive motif which will recur again and again in this account: the Arab feeling of (at least) the complacency of the British Administration in Palestine in regard to Arab disorder.

The British Administration had, within twenty-four hours' reach, first aid from Egypt, and within two days' reach, aid from Malta. Had it acted two days earlier than it did, Palestine might have been kept quiet, and the setback to the reconstruction of

the country avoided. I have indicated that the air was tense for several days before the outbreak in Jerusalem. I shall now quote the Hebrew and Arab press on this question—statements made during the trouble, after them, and *before them.*

Davar, the Labor daily, reports (after the events): "Dozens of facts and hints bore witness to the preparations of the Arabs for Friday. There were not only statements of the Arab women to their acquaintances that they would not come to town on Friday and Saturday and perhaps Sunday, because the men would not be in the village; there were not only the statements of many workers, especially those in the fertilizer works of Mr. Shemaya that they would not be present for work on Thursday because they had been invited to assemble in the Mosque. There were even more striking indications. The throngs of Arabs did not come to the Mosque on the day of the festival, as is usual, but on the evening before. It is reported that a special order of the Mufti is responsible for this. It is borne out by the heavy traffic which passed through Ramallah and the village Hashiloah, before nightfall, and continued through the whole night; also by the campfires in the surroundings of the city."

I have already quoted the Arab paper *Falastin,* which predicted the trouble on Friday and "apprehended" that the fellaheen would come up to Jerusa-

lem to give the Jews "a substantial answer." In the booklet *Jerusalem* (Hebrew), which describes the riots, an eye-witness records: "The Arabs launched the attack (at the Jaffa Gate) and cries were heard: '*Al daula Maana*': *the Government is with us!*"

A day before the events the Young Moslem Association of Haifa published the following proclamation to the Moslems of Palestine:

"Some people have applied to us with the request to give them details regarding the latest events and the *Jewish attacks on Moslems and their holy places.* We think it our duty, therefore, to enlighten the masses and inform them as to the serious events taking place in this country.

"*The Jews have ancient aspirations regarding our Mosque El Akzah in Jerusalem.* These aspirations find expression in their coming to the Wailing Wall and mourning for the Kingdom and palace of Solomon. . . .

"On Thursday, Rubija el awal (Tisha b'Ab), the day of the remembrance of the destruction of the Temple, the Palestinian Government gave the Jews permission to arrange a large demonstration in the yard of El Burak (the Wailing Wall Place) and the Moslem quarters inside Jerusalem. Hundreds of them gathered to march in a big demonstration with a Zionist banner. They arrived at El Burak and held there speeches of incitement which offended Moslem

honor. *In the markets and in the El Burak they cursed the Prophet and the Moslem religion.* That excited the anger of Moslems. They were obliged to answer the next day with a demonstration. The Moslems therefore gathered Friday[1] after prayer in the Mosque el Akzah, and swore unanimously in the name of Allah to defend the honor of the Holy Places to the last drop of blood. Afterwards thousands of them went out in a big demonstration."

This Arab statement, like many others, combines two elements. First, the incitement of the mob by dangerous and lying statements (the cursing of the Prophet, etc.) Second, it is a warning to the Government—ignored. We may note that it omits mention of the "visit" of the Arabs to the Wailing Wall and their desecration of the place.

Now as to the Arab feeling regarding the complacency of the British Administration: the correspondent of the *Alif Beh* reported the following on August 28:[2] "El Charam el Sharif (the place of the Mosque of Omar) was filled Friday with thousands of fellaheen from the villages in the vicinity of Jerusalem and Hebron, in addition to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The enlightened Arabs had felt the approaching danger. Some of the speakers called on them to be quiet, but who can calm the stormy sea?

[1] August 16, one week before the riots.

[2] Speaking, that is, of the riots which took place on Friday, August 23.

So the crowd went out of the gates of the Mosque, through the Nablus Gate near the Meah Shearim; *the soldiers stood at this gate but they did not prevent anyone, and did not try to stop anyone.*"

Dr. Elkanah of Hebron reports:

"For many days before the horror began, the poison of incitement was felt everywhere. The Arabs spoke openly, shamelessly and fearlessly of the massacre of the Jews to be arranged in the near future. They did not hesitate to reveal their whole detailed plan. . . . Facts and evidence are in the hands of the survivors. The landlord of the Hotel Nachman Segal, said to the lessee of the hotel on Thursday: 'Pay me the rent today, because tomorrow no one among you will be saved.' "

In the chapter on Hebron and Safed I quote further evidence of the preparations of the Arab mob-leaders.

In its issue of Friday, August 23rd, *Davar* reports that one of the chief Arab agitators, Farid Fahridin of Jenin, telephoned to one of his relatives at Beisan and ordered him to assemble the population and await him. He reported that the Jews had thrown three bombs into the Omar Mosque of Jerusalem, and destroyed it. The police of Jenin arrested the agitator, but the next day he came to Beth Shan.

In the Emek Jezreel, simultaneously, rumors were

set current that the Jews of Jerusalem had killed hundreds of Arabs and had attacked the Mosque of Omar.

The extraordinary currency of the belief that the Jews were actually contemplating an attack on the Mosque, or had designs on it, shows the careful work of agitators: for the story of the bombs recur with the regularity of a well-planted piece of propaganda. Everywhere, the cry is "Defend El Burak" (the Place of the Wailing Wall). The young men of Rammallah established a Committee called: "The Knights of El Burak." In a telegram to the Moslem committee for the defence of El Burak, the Knights of El Burak declare that Moslem silence in the face of Jewish impudence would be regarded as cowardice and meanness. The Moslems must depend on themselves in defending their rights.

On the Sunday before the massacre of Safed, the Arabs of that city assembled in the Mosque, and both Arab and Jewish shops were closed. In the Mosque rumors were circulated that four thousand young Jews from Tel Aviv had come up to Jerusalem, and Arab blood was shed like water. Speeches to the effect that the Mosque of Omar and the Wailing Wall had been occupied by the Jews were delivered.

It is not difficult to see that with propaganda of this kind the Arabs of Palestine could be roused to

a frenzy. Politics they do not understand, and the cry of Jewish political aspirations leaves them cold. But reports of the bombing of the Mosque of Omar and of the murder of hundreds or thousands of Arabs, was enough to set in motion both their fanaticism and their fear—a perfect combination for a mob.

At Ben Shemen one of those many incidents which relieve the horrid picture occurred (these incidents are recorded in the chapter, Foundations of Peace). A Jew has left a record of a fine spirit of unshaken friendship between Jews and Arabs, whereby the lives of the Jewish children of the Orphanage and children's farms, Kfar Ha-Noar, were saved. The record is in the form of a diary (see p. 199) and both the events and the tone of the record bespeak a friendship for the Arabs. But in it occurs the following: "Exaggerated reports reached Ludd of hundreds of casualities in Jaffa. It was also reported that in Jaffa not an Arab remained alive. A demonstration attended by a big crowd was organized. It was resolved that one part of the crowd should go to Jaffa and the other should march against Ben Shemen to revenge the blood which had been shed."

The reader is asked to compare this picture, with the fact that when the news of the massacre of Hebron reached Tel Aviv, the Municipality, which

had the information Saturday night, *withheld it for two days* for fear of the effect on the peace.

A Jewish resident of Hebron reports: At about half past two on Friday (August 23rd) we saw a young Arab arrive by motor cycle from Jerusalem. He alarmed the Arab inhabitants of Hebron, saying that the blood of thousands of Moslems in Jerusalem was being shed like water. He called to the Arabs to avenge this blood. The unrest among the Arabs of Hebron was very strong, particularly after the motor cars began to arrive from Jerusalem with news of the disturbances.

Jusif Alissah, owner of the Arab paper *Alif Beh,* who was travelling in Palestine at the time of the troubles, reports in his paper: "Incidentally I visited Haifa one day before the events in Jerusalem, and the rebellion was made known to me when I returned from Haifa to Ramallah. On the way to Janin, my automobile was stopped by a policeman who did not permit us to continue on our tour. I explained that we were going to Damascus and not to Jerusalem, and he permitted us to continue. We were stopped several times until we reached Nablus. Here the rebellion appeared in its true form. The population of Nablus went out of the town and awaited news from Jerusalem. Among the people of Nablus rumors were circulated that the Jews had blown up the 'Drinking Stone' (in the Mosque) with explosives."

Again, previous to the riots, *Davar* reports on August 20th: "Incitement of feeling against the Jews goes on, particularly round Jerusalem and Hebron. Rumors are being spread by unknown persons that on Saturday last the Jews cursed the Moslem religion, and that it is the duty of Moslems to take revenge."

Again, two days before the big riots, *Davar* reported similar incitement of Arabs to action against the Jews. In particular the rumors were growing stronger in Hebron that the Jews had attacked the Mosque of Omar, and that they were preparing a second assault on it for Friday, August 23rd. During the events the Egyptian Arab press published the news that the Jews had thrown two bombs into the Mosque but that these had injured only the outer walls.

I pass to a high authority in Arab Palestine, the Arab Executive. Elsewhere I reproduce in full the telegram sent by this body to the High Commissioner of Palestine in answer to his proclamation which denounced the attack on the Jews. Here I quote only one sentence, which indicates its encouragement of the agitators who spread the rumor that the Jews had designs on the Moslem religion and on the Moslem Holy Places. "The world will see (as a result of an impartial inquiry) that Jews, *whose aggressions have surpassed political aims to religious*

ones (sic), whose provocations have lately become insupportable, as admitted by Government, etc., were responsible for the present troubles, together with the policy supporting them."

Another curious document is the "authoritative statement" of the Arab view made by the Grand Mufti in an interview with a representative of Reuter. "Jewish ambition and greed," says the Grand Mufti, "are responsible for provoking the Arab attack, in order to gain the support of the whole world, reopen the question of the Wailing Wall and influence the Labor Government to amend the *status quo* as constituted in the 'White Paper.' "

The idea that Jews provoke attacks upon themselves in order to put their attackers at a moral and political disadvantage, is not new. An English officer in Poland, in 1919, informed me seriously (he did not know I was a Jew) that the Jews of Poland had deliberately instigated pogroms against themselves in order to have the advantage over their innocent neighbors. However, the Mufti does at least speak of an *attack* on the Jews. I continue to quote:

"The Jewish demonstration at the Wall on August 15th was made not from religious but from political motives. Young Jews marched through the Moslem quarter bearing national flags, singing national songs, and at the same time insolently threatening Arabs. From that day until the fateful August

23rd, when outbreaks began, there were many incidents of Jews insulting, attacking and injuring Arab men, women and children. *One of these incidents resulted in the death of a Jew from wounds.*"

I note first that while the Grand Mufti speaks of the Jewish demonstration, which he admits, resulted in no incidents (he has to confine himself to "insolently threatening Arabs"), he makes no mention of the Arab descent on the Wailing Wall, the beating of the *Shammas* (beadle), the burning of sacred books, etc. He then goes on to speak of attacks on Arab men, women and children *resulting in the killing of a young Jew.* If the matter were not tragic, it would offer a delicious example of the agitator's logic. I quote again:

"This (the death of Mizrachi) was again used by the Jews as an excuse for further demonstration until August 23rd, when large numbers of Moslems came to Jerusalem for prayers. Jews closed their shops and retired to their quarters. During and after the prayers I called upon all Moslems to return to their villages quietly, but owing to the large number, with Moslem sense of display, bearing swords, daggers and sticks, Jews were seized by a panic or deliberately provoked an attack by firing revolvers or throwing bombs, thus turning peaceful demonstrators into a frenzied, uncontrollable mob. The news quickly spread through Palestine that the

Jews were attacking Arabs and the Holy Moslem places were in danger."

It sickens one to have to copy out this stuff, but we are dealing here with *the highest Moslem religious authority in Palestine,* and his utterances are matters of grave importance.

First, Jews retire to their quarters to "provoke the attack." Second, Moslem love of display is made responsible for the daggers, swords and clubs of the peaceful demonstrators: it seems that Moslem love of display, in the opinion of the Grand Mufti, operates only on occasions when Jews want to provoke attacks. At other times Moslems do not express their love of display by flourishing dangerous weapons after prayers. Likewise the peacefulness of the demonstrators was so obvious to him, that he tried to send them home before they started to demonstrate. And in the end, wavering slightly, the Grand Mufti is not sure whether the Jews were thrown into a panic by the Moslem love of display, or continued the policy which he ascribed to them a few lines before, of deliberately provoking assault to obtain political advantage at the cost of death. But it is not easy even to make fun of this document. It is altogether too grotesque for coherent criticism.

I have thrown into one chapter the material which proves premeditated attack, Government behavior which resembles connivance (itself an encour-

agement) and the nature of the Arab propaganda, because the subjects cannot be dissociated. But I wish once more to draw the attention of the reader to the shocking and consistent use which has been made of religious fanaticism by the spread of fantastic untruths. It is not easy for me to speak of the falsehood of the accusations concerning Jewish designs on the Moslem Holy Places, for they contain material so alien to the sentiments of the Jews, that I scarcely know where to begin. The builders of Jewish Palestine are not weepers at the Wailing Wall. The place is sacred to them—but the most sacred of their feelings are associated with the tilling of the soil and the building of schools and the lifting up of the country from the decay into which it has sunk. Their thoughts are with the future and not with the past. The old Jews, the religious Jews, to whom the Wailing Wall is the memory of a splendor almost not of this world, have no notion of action of *any* kind. Palestine would have waited for the Messiah, if the old Jews had had their way. One need not be an old religious Jew to resent profanation of the Wailing Wall Place, and to protest against offensive encroachments by people who care nothing for the memories which Jews associate with it. But after having worked for many years in the Zionist movement, after having heard all manner of sensible people and cranks, I cannot

remember a single instance of any Jew who wanted to disturb the Mosque of Omar, or interfere with the religious sentiments of the Arabs. To the Jews who are streaming from the West toward Palestine (the "aggressive" Jews, meaning the builders of the country) the name Mahomet carries only a quaint and even pleasing sound. We are accustomed to thinking of Mohammedanism as of something akin to us. We have not had dinned into our ears, for many, many centuries, the epithet: "Mahomet-killers." We have no involved controversies as to our rôle in the life of the founder of the Moslem religion. The fable of our aggressive projects against the Mosque, of our contempt for the Moslem religion, is so daringly distant from all truth, that there is not even a possibility of intelligible denial.

But this helps us little with the Arabs. The vast majority of the Arabs are illiterate. Most of those that can read or write belong to the Christian and not the Moslem Church. When I pass the serried, gray houses of stone and adobe, of the Arab villages, when I think of the hopeless interval which lies between this abandoned and abused people and the Jew who is coming to Palestine out of the West, I realize that these Arabs will believe anything that is told them concerning us. In such a land-locked sea of ignorance and mental helplessness, the strangest

monsters will flourish. And our only hope of a rapprochement lies in immediate contact and in education. But immediate contact is not easy, except where Jews live side by side with Arabs in the open. I shall record further on where such contact has achieved partial success in the building up of a human relationship. But the great majority of Arabs are susceptible to any propaganda concerning us. And while they will not respond to the cry of nationalism, to the "threat" of Jewish reconstruction, they will respond only too quickly to the first intimation of assault on their religion. Patriotism as the last refuge of a desperate scoundrel is not yet possible among the Arabs of Palestine: religion must supply its place. And when the most enlightened Arabs conspire to make this refuge possible, we are faced with a fearful problem, which only skill, patience and strong self-defence can solve in time. But that the rights of the Jewish people to build themselves a home in Palestine should be thwarted by pure slander is unthinkable.

CHAPTER VII

Jerusalem

ON Thursday evening, August 22nd, and on the Friday morning following, between ten and twenty thousand Arabs came streaming into Jerusalem. It has been inaccurately stated that Friday the 23rd was a high Moslem holiday. It was not. It was an ordinary Moslem Sabbath. It is universally admitted that the Arabs came heavily armed. The Grand Mufti accounts for the fact, as we have seen, as an outburst of the Moslem love of display. No serious attempt could be made to disarm the Moslems with the forces then available in Jerusalem. The Arab police (who form a large majority in a city where the Jews are a majority of the population) could not in any case have been trusted to carry out this task. The weapons were, besides firearms, swords, daggers and *nabuts*—the Arab club.

The trouble began at the Jaffa Gate. At about 12:30 o'clock a group of Arabs of about two hundred men, waving their weapons, and shouting, came out of the narrow street behind the gate, and advanced down the Jaffa road. On emerging, they were in the presence of English and Arab police, *who*

made no attempt to stop them. This is asserted by Jewish and Arab accounts. That they could have been stopped before they emerged into the Jaffa road is proved by the subsequent action of the police in stopping a much larger crowd when murders had already been committed. This first group, however, got as far as the city gardens, accompanied (or as some accounts write, escorted) by mounted police. On the way to the city gardens they wounded one Jew—Nissan Baumgarten. Close by the city gardens they wounded a number of others, among them Dr. Wolfgang von Weisel, the journalist. He was stabbed from behind, and his left lung was pierced. At this time of writing he is still in the Hadassah hospital. Eyewitnesses report that Dr. von Weisel defended himself for several minutes, till he was attacked from behind. This took place in the presence of the police. Here, too, Ittamar ben Avi was assaulted. At the city gardens the Arabs were met by showers of stones from the houses. The police were strong enough to hustle the Arab mob into the Russian Courtyard, and from there to disperse it. It would have been infinitely easier to hold this crowd at the Jaffa Gate. An eye-witness states, with unintentional sarcasm, that the police could have dispersed this Arab mob with the means used against the Jewish funeral procession two days before.

After this first, smaller mob had passed through

the Jaffa Gate, a second, larger mob (some five hundred men) came through it. Ten British and some Arab policemen confronted it. Some of the city Arabs, among them Mr. Parchi Nashashibi, stood between the mob and the police, and tried to hold the mob back, even dragging some of the Arabs by the hair.

At this time (about 1:30 p.m.) Mr. Luke, Acting High Commissioner, accompanied by other British officials, appeared on the scene. Mr. Luke ordered up two street-watering carts, and turned a hose on the mob. At the same time the British attacked with clubs, and this mob was scattered; but not before it had done damage. A young Jewish boy who was coming up from the old city was surrounded by the mob. When the mob opened and let him through, the boy ran some paces, with smashed head and body pierced with wounds, blood spouting from his mouth, and fell on the steps of the Anglo-Palestine Company building. Two Jewish workers, Joseph and Judah Rothenberg, were at work on a tower of the English Electrical Company when the mob came up. They left their work, were caught by the mob, and were murdered near the Jaffa Gate.

Another mob, leaving the Mosque after prayer, proceeded through the old city to the Nablus Gate, for an attack on the Meah Shearim, an entirely Jewish quarter. Six mounted police went with them, and

made no attempt to hold them back. But in the Meah Shearim the rioters came up against a stiff Jewish resistance. They were thrown back, repeated the attack and were thrown back a second time. Finally the British police appeared, and also began to fire.[1] The Arabs fled, leaving behind them two dead and one heavily wounded.

In another section of the city the Jewish self-defence was also strong—at Yemin Moshe. Here the attack began at about 2:45 p.m. The assailants were received with shots, and with showers of stones. The total number of assaults made here, before police arrived, was six. Every assault was repulsed. The Arabs retired, leaving dead and wounded on the ground.

The greatest Jewish losses took place where there was neither a Jewish self-defence nor any help from the police. The supineness of the police would be incredible if it were not attested by so many witnesses. The worst instance was in the attack on the Georgian quarter. When the mob poured through the Nablus Gate, it divided into two sections. One section went to the Meah Shearim where, as stated above, it did not fare so well. The second section did better by going to the Georgian quarter, where it met with no resistance either on the part of the Jews

[1]In view of the statement of Mr. Luke, Acting High Commissioner, to Mr. ben Zwi (see further on) the police must either have used blank cartridges or fired in the air.

or of the police. The houses were locked. The mob began to throw stones and to fire through the windows. After a time it was re-inforced by Arabs who had been repulsed in the Meah Shearim, and these, with their reports of Arabs killed, roused the augmented mob to a frenzy. The first house attacked was the one behind the automobile office of Chabubu. Failing to break in, some Arabs climbed onto the roof, sprang into the courtyard and opened the gate to the mob. A beastly slaughter began.

Shalom Zavnini Shvili who defended his family (consisting of a pregnant wife and five children) was killed at once. The mob then found his wife Mezel (she was in her eighth month) and wounded her. In the same courtyard the sister-in-law of the murdered man was also killed—the wife of ben Zivia Shvili.

Similar massacres took place in other courtyards of this section. I will not go into the disgusting details; they represent a uniform story of murder and pillage. The most ignoble circumstance in connection with this part of the riots is, *that the police did not interfere for two hours.* Two witnesses have recorded that British officials stood on the balcony of the Government House, in this vicinity, heard the screaming and the shots—and did nothing. One of these witnesses, writing in the "Doar Hayom," says he was a Jewish policeman on guard at the Govern-

ment House. (Several Jewish policemen resigned from the force after the riots.)

The attack on the Georgian quarter, it is reported, was made not by villagers and fellaheen, as was the case in other parts of the town, but mostly by city dwellers, some of whom can be identified by witnesses.

During this and the following days, one of the central Jewish figures was the labor leader Isaac ben Zwi. The Yishub was without its usual leadership—for every important man was absent attending what was considered one of the most important events in recent Jewish history—the formation of the Jewish Agency. Mr. ben Zwi, Mr. Horowitz of the Zionist Executive and a few others were charged with the fearful responsibilities of those days.

Mr. ben Zwi has given me the following account of part of his activity. It will help to explain some of the foregoing facts:

"At three o'clock that Friday afternoon, August 23, I went with a representative of the Zionist Executive to Mr. Saunders, the Chief of Police, and said: 'It is obvious to us that your forces are small. We have two suggestions to make. First, that you mobilize all the Jewish ex-soldiers now in Jerusalem. Second, that you form a special police for the various districts.' Mr. Saunders agreed to the second proposition, and forty young Jews were armed with rifles

and assigned to various districts, under the command of the police. But the troubles still continued, and it was obvious to me that many more men were needed to prevent further bloodshed. That afternoon Mr. Solomon and I listed, in different parts of the city, 500 names of men willing to act, under Government orders, as a self-defence. At 6 p.m. we gave this list to Saunders, and asked him to act. He asked till next morning to think it over. During the night some fierce attacks took place in various sections of the town. Saturday morning at nine o'clock we returned to Saunders. We did not find him. We therefore went direct to the home of the Acting High Commissioner, Mr. Luke, and placed the situation before him. Mr. Luke, too, put us off. He said he was expecting help by aeroplane. He would then turn over the military command to the group Captain. But he was himself against the further arming of Jews and would like to have the forty Jews disarmed as soon as possible. I said to him: 'Suppose you do turn over the military command to the group Captain: you will still be shorthanded.' Mr. Luke replied: 'There will be a big difference then. *Until now we gave orders not to shoot.*' We were so startled that we could not believe our ears. We asked him what he meant. Mr. Luke said: 'As the Arab police had no firearms, we told the British not to use theirs.' We placed an ultimatum before Mr.

Luke, stating that if he would not accede to our request we would protest at once to the Home Government via the London Executive. Mr. Luke still procrastinated. Before sending the telegram, we showed it to him. But he did not change. I said to him: 'Many have already fallen, but not one by a Government bullet. Yesterday we could have stopped the riots with very few victims. Today, who knows how many must fall before we can restore calm.' "

At three o'clock of that Friday armed Arabs advanced to the assault of the farm of the women workers, which is behind Talpioth. At the time only the watchman was on the premises. He exchanged shots for some time with the attackers, and was finally rescued by Jews, two of the rescuers being wounded. When these had abandoned the place, the Arabs returned, and began the work of plunder. We shall see that throughout the country the mobs combined religion with business, and made a thorough job of cleaning out every place which was abandoned by the Jews. Further on I shall quote Government reports of recovery of loot. (I suppose the Grand Mufti, who attributed the arming of the Arabs to a Moslem sense of display, will attribute these robberies to a Moslem love of souvenirs.) It goes without saying that not a single instance has so far been reported by the Government of robbery

by Jews; I am ashamed to have even to mention this fact.

And now the attack became general. Kiriath Moshe, Bait ve-Gan, Beth ha-Kerem were attacked. In every place the police appeared after long delay. Had it not been for the young Jews sent from place to place in machines, a fearful massacre would have taken place. In general, as ben Avi correctly states, the assault, after the first surprise, changed into something which the Arabs had not anticipated. Believing that the police would stand by without interference, believing too that the Jews would be without defence of any kind, they had looked forward to a riot of murder and robbery such as took place in Hebron and Safed. But instead of a massacre, the assault became a battle; there was heavy street-fighting in which the Jews, recovering from their amazement at the incapacity of the police, defended themselves, in many quarters, with success and distinction.

A group of Oxford students, then on a visit to Palestine, won the golden opinion of the Jews of Jerusalem—and of Jews throughout the world—by their generosity and courage. They were found in many parts of the city, fighting side by side with the Jews. One of them was severely wounded, and was taken to the Hadassah hospital. Their behavior stands out in striking contrast to the behavior of the police and the Administration as a whole. There

were, however, encouraging and noble individual exceptions.

I cannot go into a detailed description of all the fighting. The records will be found in the sources which, side by side with many personal statements to me by eye-witnesses, I am using for this book. But I cannot help quoting a few outstanding incidents. Talpioth, the charming little suburb which we have built up south of Jerusalem, on the way to Bethlehem, was assaulted Friday night from the side of the village of Zurbahir. But the attackers were Bedouins. The Arabs of Zurbahir, who derive their living largely from the sale of their produce to the Jews, did not participate in the attack. The Jews returned the fire of the attackers, and the assault was abandoned till the next morning, at five o'clock. In the renewed attack the villagers of Beth Zafafa participated. Two girls were wounded in the house of Professor Klausner. At six o'clock a Jew, Moses Brandes, was killed. Later, the British sent relief, and the attack was abandoned. At once the British left the vicinity—and the attack was renewed. Several times this game of hide and seek was repeated. At about 2 a.m. on Sunday, the British ordered the district evacuated. Orders for evacuation, due to the inability of the British to defend the property as well as the lives of the Jews, were frequent all over the country. Such orders left Jewish quarters at the

mercy of looters, and the Jews sustained fearful material losses. In the case of Talpioth, eighteen houses were plundered after the evacuation. Among them were the houses of Professor Klausner and of the writer Agnon. What the looters could not take away they destroyed in pure vandalism. Documents and manuscripts, some of them unique and irreplaceable, were burned. The British police returned later that morning, after the damage had been done, and set a guard about the place.

Another Arab village which distinguished itself in infamy and ingratitude was Lifta, on the road to Tel Aviv. Like most of the Arab villages surrounding Jerusalem, Lifta derived a large income from the sale of its produce to the Jews. But Lifta not only attacked on the day of the riots, but served as a center of organization, and as an armory, before the assaults. The names of six Lifta villagers who were in Jerusalem previous to the riots, collecting money for arms, are known. The men of Lifta came to the attack on Friday afternoon at four o'clock and concentrated against Romema, Nachlath Zion and Shaareh Zedek. A characteristic incident took place in this attack. Half an hour after the attack began, some automobiles with British police and officials appeared on the scene. Some of the Arabs fled. Others—between forty and fifty of them, it is estimated—went up to the roof of an Arab house. Two

separate accounts relate that the British did not attack these rioters. Instead they negotiated with the Arabs to come out and disarm! A local Old People's Home, being attacked by Arabs, sent word for help. Again the British came, showed themselves, and did not fire on the attackers.

Of the districts attacked in Jerusalem, the following were defended by the Jewish Haganah (self-defence): Yemin Moshe, the Old City (helped by the police), Meah Shearim, the Bokharian quarter, Romemah, Talpioth, Beth ha-Kerem and Rechavia. The possession of arms by the Jews was at all times and everywhere illegal, and any Jew caught in the possession of arms was disarmed. In Jerusalem and elsewhere dozens of Jews were arrested for carrying arms. At this time of writing (September 11) they are either in prison or (in very few cases) out under heavy bail!

Throughout the book, the reader will find instances of the disarming of Jews under amazing circumstances. When the British appeared, during an attack, the Arabs either fled or were driven off; they therefore could not be disarmed. The Jews being the attacked, naturally remained on the spot—and were frequently disarmed. Mr. ben Zwi reported to me: "On Tuesday, August 27, at 8 p.m., a British patrol in two automobiles came up to Rechavia. The patrol met a Jewish machine, stopped it, and found

revolvers in the possession of the chauffeur. Everyone in the machine was arrested and is still (September 3) in prison. Yet three or four hours before, Rechavia had been under fierce attack. Thus the activity of the British tended to render the Jews defenceless. The situation in Rechavia was bad for two days more. On Wednesday and Thursday shots were fired into the district from various points."

I will not go further into the riots in Jerusalem, having already indicated their character, and the nature of the situation.

Motzah

Motzah is a small settlement near Jerusalem, on the way to Tel Aviv. It is best known for its Sanatorium, and is becoming popular as a health resort. Close by, divided from the settlement by a valley, is the Arab village of Quolonia. On Friday the Sheikh of this village visited Motzah, and swore by God and the Koran that he and his men would defend the Jews from all attack. At noon, on Saturday, about thirty Arabs came up from the dividing valley, and attacked the houses at the nearest end of the settlement. One house, owned by the Maklov family, was also a small hotel, and at the time there were among its guests some visitors from Tel Aviv. On the approach of the Arabs, some of the visitors fled, and the Arabs, who were out for loot, as well as for

murder, did not pursue them. The family remained behind, among others, to guard its property. The Maklov family (the father aged fifty, two daughters, eighteen and twenty, a son, aged twenty-two) and two guests, Rabbi Solomon Schlacht, aged eighty-five, and Mr. Glaser, aged sixty, both of Tel Aviv, were butchered with knives. Two children were saved. The attack was carried out with extraordinary rapidity and savagery. After the massacre, and after the looting of the house, the Arabs set fire to it. (I saw the house a few days later. It was completely gutted.) A group of the Jewish self-defence, rushed out by car from Jerusalem to Motza, hurdled a low stone barrier set up by the Arabs, ran most of the way on a puncture, and arrived too late to save the Maklov family. But they held the Arabs at bay until the arrival of a British armored car, two hours later.

A week and a half later Mr. Broza, one of the oldest residents of Motza at its head (he had been one of its founders forty years ago), was arrested on the denunciation of a local Arab. He was released on bail of twenty-five hundred dollars (a large sum in Palestine) furnished by the Anglo-Palestine Company.

The massacre at Motza has the same character as the massacres at Hebron and Safed, of which I shall now tell.

CHAPTER VIII

Hebron and Safed

THERE are four "Sacred Cities" in Palestine: Jerusalem, Tiberias, Hebron and Safed; and at all times since the remote beginnings of the Jewish connection with the country, one or more of these places have continued the tradition of Jewish residence in Palestine. Hebron is dear to Jewish memory because it is linked with the earliest stories of our people, those that go back to pre-Palestinian days. In Safed, during the late Middle Ages, grew up a great cabbalistic movement which has left a deep mark on Jewish thought. Hebron and Safed have retained to the present day the tradition of the Middle Ages. They are still, but in a declining degree, strongholds of *Halukkah* Jewry: of groups of Jews whose outlook on Palestine connected it with the remotest past and with the remotest future, with the beginning and the end of things. They are dwindling memorials of the times when Jews had ceased to hope for human release from human oppression, when they asserted their claim to Palestine only by going to die there. Small groups of younger people gathered round them, and

the community lived largely on the charity of the Jews in the Diaspora. We have outlived this strange form of passive assertion, and like all outlived things Halukkah Jewry in Palestine dies hard, feeling the injustice of the new age. For it cannot forget that when no other means were offered us, it registered in legal and moral continuity the right of a people to be restored to its own. That feeling of injustice, keen at first, has been mitigated during later years by a recognition of the change that has come over Jewish history: the new building of Palestine is not in opposition to, but the historical complement of, Halukkah Jewry.

The Jews of Hebron and of Safed therefore belonged to the type which did not know how to fight, but knew how to die. Its heroism was passive. There was not in either city even the beginnings of a self-defence. The arms of those Jews were prayers; and their last protest in the face of death the reaffirmation of the Unity of the Name. Two shocking circumstances distinguish the massacres in these towns from all others. Both towns were known to be in danger; both were known to be utterly defenceless; both implored help; both were abandoned to their fate. The Hebron massacre took place one day after the riots in Jerusalem; *the Safed massacre six days after.*

The memorial of the Jewish community of Heb-

ron, or of its survivors—refugees in Jerusalem—bears witness first to the long history of friendship between the Jews and Arabs of that city. There were about five hundred souls in the Jewish community. Many of the families trace their ancestry back to refugees from the Spanish Inquisition; these are Sephardic Jews who are bilingual,—speaking Arabic and Hebrew with equal naturalness. They lived in an ancient ghetto, enclosed by heavy walls. Within the last two or three decades a new community of Jews sprang up side by side with them: refugees from more modern persecutions, Jews of eastern Europe.

On Friday morning, the day of the outbreak in Jerusalem, the Jews of Hebron were already alarmed. The day before, Aref el Aref, Arab Governor of Ber Sheba, had been in the City and had preached in the Mosque. His words were repeated to the Jews; in the midst of open incitement to riot recurred those familiar and sinister words: "The Government is with us!"

Aref el Aref is too well known to the Jews of Palestine. Together with the present Grand Mufti, Emil el Husseini, he was tried in 1920 for his part in the riots of that year. Both men were sentenced to several years' imprisonment. Emil el Husseini was amnestied at once, Aref el Aref after a short term of imprisonment in Acre. Unlike Abou Kishek of Petach Tikvah, neither of these men was moved by

the act of grace. They have continued to be dangerous to the peace of their country until this day.

The visit of Aref el Aref to Hebron on Thursday bore very early fruit. On Friday morning the Jews of Hebron received, from an Arab source, the news that the Arabs were arming. Rabbi Jacob Slonim, head of the Sephardic Jewish community, and Rabbi Frank, head of the Ashkenazic community, turned to the Arab Governor of Hebron, Abdullah Kardos. The memorial of the Jews of Hebron states: "The Governor calmed us and said: 'There is no fear of anything happening. The British Government knows what it has to do. In the place where two soldiers are needed, it sends six.' And he added: 'I tell you in confidence that they have many soldiers in the streets, in civilian clothes; these soldiers circulate among the crowds, and in the hour of need they will fulfill their duty.' "

On Friday afternoon, an Arab mob broke into the Yeshivah, and killed the only student who had remained there—Samuel Rosenholtz, known among the Jews of Hebron as the *mathmid,*—a name given to those who distinguish themselves by their devotion to study. On Saturday morning, before the slaughter began, the Rabbis again appealed to the Governor for help. Again they received the same astounding assurances. Bewildered, they turned to Mr. Cafferata, the British officer in charge of the

police. From him, too, they received assurances of safety. I find such difficulty in believing this story, that I have looked at every record of eye-witnesses, without finding a contradiction.

For two hours on the morning of Saturday, August 24, there raged in Hebron a scene which it is not easy to parallel even in the mediæval annals of the Jewish people. For two hours neither the Governor of Hebron nor the British officer interfered. From English papers I cull a story of the heroism of Mr. Cafferata in attempting to stop the massacre.[1] I look in vain for a single confirmation in the records of Jewish witnesses. They have preserved with gratitude every instance of mercy and kindliness which came to their notice. They mention the humaneness of Commander Partridge of Gaza, in his treatment of the sick. They recall, both in the memorial and in the individual statements, the gallantry of Arab friends and landlords: "The family Moshe Masha, the family Borowsky, the family of Rabbi Slonim, the family Schnauirsohn were thus rescued." They recall even the unsuccessful efforts of one Arab, Nassar Eldine, to protect the Jews in his house. And they record, with damning unanimity, that Mr. Cafferata did nothing for two hours. But the memorial states: "From our knowledge, we say with certainty that it

[1]Since the above was written, newspapers report that Mr. Cafferata has been decorated for heroism.

would have sufficed to issue a warning, or to fire some shots into the air, and the crowd would have scattered. It was only after there had been sufficient butchery, plunder and rape, and the pogromists were about to attack an English officer, that some shots were fired, and the mob dispersed at once." An eye-witness states: "The massacre lasted an hour and a half. There were then heard six shots and the murderers scattered. Those that would not scatter were fired on by the English commander. Then twenty-five Arabs fell."

There are records of courage shown by attacked Jews, in their last agonies, which bear witness to the fact that the community of Hebron had inherited a full measure of Jewish tradition. There are stories of students who, dying, laid themselves across the bodies of unwounded comrades, smeared them with blood, and saved them. There is the record of an Arab landlady, who sheltered Jews at the peril of her life; who, when the Jewish children cried, wailed at the top of her voice in Arabic to drown the betraying noise. But there is no record that Mr. Cafferata interfered during the two hours of the slaughter. Only: "If it had not been for some Arab families, which defended Jews, not a Jewish soul in Hebron would have been saved."

With equal unanimity the witnesses state that for the morning of the massacre the police had been

disarmed by the Arab Governor of Hebron; and that when they received their weapons again—at the end of the two hours—they easily dispersed the mob.

Zwi Greenberg of Tel Aviv, a survivor, speaking of the treatment of the wounded after the massacre, states: "Our condition in the police house was ghastly. . . . There was no water. One Englishman took pity on us and brought us a can of water. There was no toilet. . . . We begged to be allowed to telephone or telegraph to Jerusalem. We were not permitted. We said, 'We will telegraph only that we are well.' But the Governor only wanted us to wire: 'Hebron all right.' "

The memorial states, concerning the same subject: "The attitude of the officials in the Government house, with the exception of Commander Partridge, was beneath criticism."

The memorial of the Jews of Hebron, as submitted to the High Commissioner of Palestine, closes with these words:

"In the name of sixty-five slaughtered, fifty-eight wounded, and many orphans and widows; in the name of the remnants of the plundered and the tortured we accuse:

"1. The Government, which did not fulfill its duty and provide protection for its peaceful and defenceless charges.

"2. The Governor, Abdullah Kardos, and the Commander, Cafferata, *who deprived us of the means of appealing for help and defence,* betrayed us with empty promises, and gave the murderers and robbers their opportunity.

"3. The police, which did not fulfill its duty, and behaved with contemptible baseness.

"4. The emissaries of the Mufti and of the Moslem Council, in particular the Sheikh Talib Narka and his colleagues, those mentioned above, as well as those who have not been mentioned, who proclaimed the massacre and permitted murder and rape.

"5. Also the inhabitants of Hebron (with the exception of some families) who did not rise to help their brothers and neighbors in accordance with commandments of the Koran. . . ."

It is useless to go more closely into the details of the butchery in Hebron, or to parallel the record with the story of Safed. One cannot read the depositions of eye-witnesses without a twinge of loathing for the human species itself. But it is proper to recall that the massacre in Safed stands out, among all the events in Palestine, as the most incomprehensible. Evidences of unrest had been noted in the city for many days: the demonstrations; the repetition of the slogan, "The Government is with us": the circulation of rumors of the murder of hundreds of Moslems by the Jews—all the symptoms which

had by then become familiar to the Jews and to the Government. Troops were now in the country in sufficient number to afford protection for Safed. According to eyewitnesses with whom I spoke, the local British Commander, Mr. Farraday, begged for them well in advance of the attack. Troops were despatched late; they were further delayed by accident—and the result was a massacre (attended this time by a furious destruction of property) which equalled in bestiality, though fortunately not in extent, the massacre of Hebron.

It gives one a queer feeling to read in "The Palestine Bulletin" of September 12: "The District Commissioner for the North has issued an order forbidding the disseminating of false rumors which may cause disturbances. Those contravening the order will be liable to six months' imprisonment or a fine of fifty pounds, or both." The order was published nearly three weeks after it was too late.

CHAPTER IX

"Neutrality"

ON Saturday, August 24, the Government of Palestine ordered the suspension of all newspapers in the country, without regard to their activities as keepers or troublers of the peace. The sole sources of news were thus, for some time, the official communiqués and bulletins posted up by the Government. I shall now go into a detailed examination of the text of some of these bulletins, in order that the reader may understand why the Jewish authorities in Palestine accuse the Government of having adopted an attitude of neutrality as between the criminal and the peaceful citizen; standing between the two not in the character of organized justice, but of an outsider indifferent as to the motives and purposes of the two groups of combatants, of which one is on the offensive, the other on the defensive.

There are in Palestine about one hundred and sixty thousand Jews and nearly five times as many Arabs. The likelihood of a Jewish assault upon the Arabs is *a priore* remote. Not the difference in numbers alone makes this obvious. There is, more

EVANGEL
SCHOOL OF

important, the difference in the criminal records of the two groups of the population. The Jews of Palestine have practically no criminal record. The Arabs of Palestine have a higher criminal record than any people of the Western World. But not relying on these general though cogent considerations, I have gone into the history of the preliminaries to the disturbances. I have shown that there was a consistent propaganda on the side of the Arabs, leading toward an attack on the Jews: and an equally consistent propaganda of warning to the Government on the side of the Jews. When the attack began, it was in Jerusalem, into which had streamed between ten and twenty thousand Arabs, from all parts of the country. But the first communiqué issued by the Government ran as follows:

"Disturbances have broken out in Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine during the last twenty-four hours, resulting in the destruction of life and property.

"Government are taking the necessary measures to restore order and are carrying out their duty of protecting the lives and property of all the inhabitants of Palestine without distinction, and will continue to do so until order is completely restored.

"It is the duty of all sections of the population to desist from acts of violence and of all persons to return peacefully to their normal occupations.

"It should be understood that Government are always prepared to receive deputations to represent the views and demands of the different communities, but that the restoration of law and order is the first essential.

"24th August, 1929."

When an inflamed and misled mob of Arabs goes up to Jerusalem and attacks the Jewish population: when the defenceless Jewish community of Hebron (an island in a Moslem sea) is almost destroyed: when an unsuspecting settlement like Motza is visited with murder and plunder (these things had all happened by noon of August 24), the Government conceives it to be its duty to issue a bulletin such as I have reproduced: leaving it to the imagination of the uninformed to deduce that the attack was mutual, and that nothing can be said as to the guilt of one party, the innocence of the other.

This outrage against truth and honesty might have been forgiven if (as such outrages unfortunately do sometimes) it had at least served the public well-being for the moment. But it must be obvious to a child that when the attacker is thus classed with the attacked, the criminal with the innocent man, the very sense of order is destroyed. What must the Arabs have thought when they saw their deliberate assault on the Jewish community treated as an anonymous disaster? What *can* they

have thought but that the Government of Palestine did not wish to identify them? And even though the Government was exerting itself to quell the riots, the only further conclusion which the mob leaders could have drawn, was that they were perhaps going too far by now, but that the Government was not so blind as to expose them at once. Can anyone believe that the distortion of the truth which is embodied in this bulletin was likely to strike criminals with fear and inspire the innocent with a renewed sense of security?

And lest the reader should suspect that I am pressing too closely the blunder of a distracted and terrified group of officials, I quote from subsequent bulletins issued by the Administration of Palestine until the return of the High Commissioner, Sir John Chancellor.

The Hebron massacre is reported as follows: "A serious attack on the Jewish quarter of Hebron yesterday morning resulted in heavy loss of life. It is reported that more than forty-five Jews and eight Moslems were killed, and more than fifty-nine Jews and ten Moslems wounded." (Bulletin No. 1.)

The effect of this bulletin is as follows: "Moslems attacked and Jews defended themselves. There was heavy loss of life. The Jews, however, suffered much more heavily than the Moslems."

The truth is, of course, that this was not an

attack, but a simple massacre; that the Jews were utterly incapable of self-defence; that the eight Moslems killed and ten wounded were not the result of a Jewish self-defence, but the result of belated action on the part of a British officer.

I insist, as every fair-minded reader must, on the difference between the two pictures: the true picture, and the picture implied in the Government report. For the blurring of this difference also blurs the foulness of the crime which was committed, and tends to leave the Moslem population with a feeling of satisfaction. *"There was a fight, and the Jews got the worst of it!"* Instead of seeking to rouse the disgust and resentment of Moslems against this abomination, the bulletin seems to be seeking to rouse their fighting instinct.

In Bulletin No. 2 the Government lumped Hebron and Jerusalem together under one heading, and reported:

"Jerusalem and Hebron, 78 Jews killed, 28 Arabs. Jaffa, 4 Jews, 10 Arabs. Haifa, 1 Jew, — Arabs."

I do not know what quaint reasons the Government will plead for putting Jerusalem and Hebron under one caption for the purpose of this report. But every reason of decency and fair-mindedness should have impelled it to separate them. What it reported of Hebron was true of Jerusalem: namely,

Arabs attacked, Jews defended themselves (only in some sections); so many dead on each side. As if not satisfied that the first report had falsified the situation powerfully enough, the Government guarded against all possible "misunderstanding," by issuing the second: confusing two situations, and refusing to shock the Arab public mind by a denunciation such as was issued later by Sir John Chancellor. Again one is compelled to ask: *Can* the Arab mob leaders have seen anything but indirect encouragement in this glossing over of the Hebron massacre?

But Hebron does not stand alone in this respect. There is in Palestine a city called Beisan (or Beth Shan). It has an Arab population of about two thousand, and in the midst of it live between thirty and forty Jewish familes. Common sense alone would teach us to mistrust a Government report which runs as follows:

"Yesterday morning a clash occurred between Arabs and Jews resident in Beisan. Two Jews were severely wounded and eight slightly wounded. Order was rapidly restored."

How can one talk of a clash between forty Jewish families and ten times as many Arab families? What is the complex which perpetually prevents the Palestine administration from speaking out frankly and honestly, from saying, in this instance, "Yesterday

the Arabs of Beisan attacked the Jews; two Jews were severely wounded, eight slightly wounded"?

As if in derision of the Government fear of blackening the Arab character, an Arab newspaper spoke out boldly and openly. The correspondent of the *El Ahrar* of Beyrout reports in the issue of August 28: "The inhabitants of some Arab villages near Beisan attacked some Zionist settlements, set fire to some houses and wounded twenty-one Jews. From among the Arabs one was wounded." This Arab report confuses the attacks in the whole district, on the Jews of Beisan, and on the settlement of Beth Alpha (for in Beth Alpha there were no Jewish casualties). But it does speak of an Arab attack, and not, as the Government does, of a "clash."

In another instance, too, the correspondent of the *El Ahrar,* comes to the rescue of the truth. In Bulletin No. 1 the Government reports, on Haifa:

"A small number of Arabs entered the Hadar Ha-Carmel quarter in Haifa but were ejected by the police without difficulty."

In Bulletin No. 2, this incident, which even by Government report was an Arab assault on Jews, is referred to as a clash. For the Government now states (Bulletin No. 2): "Yesterday Arabs and Jews *again* came into conflict near the Hadar Ha-Carmel quarter but were dispersed by the police.

Further conflict this morning was prevented by the arrival of a company of the Green Howards from Jerusalem which arrived in Haifa overnight. Attempts by neighboring villages to come into Haifa were frustrated."

The following, however, is the gleeful report of the Arab newspaper *El Ahrar:*

"About nine o'clock in the evening some three hundred Arabs went to Hadar Ha-Carmel and held a demonstration there. The inhabitants of this section, trembling with fear, hid in their houses, bolted the windows and locked the doors. The Arab demonstrators passed through the streets of Hadar Ha-Carmel and challenged the Jews to come out and fight. The Jews gave no reply. Then the demonstrators began throwing stones at the windows and doors. Some say that the Arabs also shot. All this was done by Arabs and the Jews did not dare to come out of their shelter."

Subsequently the paper reports (August 30): "During the events in Haifa some of the Jewish shops were plundered in the market which is at the eastern end of the town. Some cases of incendiarism and murder also occurred."

In point of offensiveness, perhaps the worst sentence in the Government report is: "Jews and Arabs again came into conflict near the Hadar Ha-Carmel, but were dispersed by the police." This grouping of

Jews and Arabs in one class of rioters and disturbers of the public peace, is possible only with a Government which has a persistently hostile attitude toward the Jewish population.

I have already stated that the massacre in Safed differed in extent, but not in character, from the massacre in Hebron. The following is the report of the Government, in Bulletin No. 5.

"Disorders broke out in Safed at about 6.15 p.m. on the 29th. Troops arrived at 8.35 and immediately restored order. There were several casualties and many houses were burned. The Jewish population was promptly removed to a place of safety in the town. Quiet has prevailed in Safed since."

And with this report the Government, which had suppressed the newspapers, dismisses the ferocious butchery of fifteen unarmed men, women and children, the wounding of many more, and the total ruination of many survivors. It is superfluous to insist again on the effect this must produce on the Arab mind. (Of its effect on the Jewish mind I do not wish to speak.) But I cannot help adding that no newspaper, by whatever misrepresentation and incitement, could more effectively create panic in one section of a population, and awaken murder lust in another.

A sample of the kind of proclamation that might have been issued in good time by the Government

was furnished by Sir John Chancellor on his return. I reproduce it in full, in order that the contrast with the statements of the Palestinian officials might be clear in the mind of the reader:

"I have returned from the United Kindom to find to my distress the country in a state of disorder and a prey to unlawful violence.

"I have learned with horror of the atrocious acts committed by bodies of ruthless and bloodthirsty evil-doers, of savage murders perpetrated upon defenceless members of the Jewish population, regardless of age or sex, accompanied, as at Hebron, by acts of unspeakable savagery, of the burning of farms and houses in town and country and of the looting and destruction of property.

"These crimes have brought upon their authors the execration of all civilized peoples throughout the world.

"My first duties are to restore order in the country, and to inflict stern punishment upon those found guilty of acts of violence. All necessary measures will be taken to achieve those ends. And I charge all the inhabitants of Palestine to assist me in discharging these duties.

"In accordance with an undertaking which I have given to the Committee of the Arab Executive before I left Palestine in June, I initiated discussions with the Secretary of State when in England on the

subject of constitutional changes in Palestine. In view of recent events I shall suspend these discussions with His Majesty's Government.

"In order to put a stop to the mendacious statements which have recently been circulated on the subject of the Wailing Wall, I hereby with the consent of His Majesty's Government make it known that I intend to give effect to the principles laid down in the White Paper of the 19th November, 1928, after the methods of applying them have been determined.

J. R. Chancellor,
High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief.
This first day of September, 1929."

Thus, after more than a week of murder and pillage, the Arab mobs were advised by the Government that their general guilt was understood: that the riots were not going to be regarded as a two-sided affair, as a sort of civil war, in which both parties had taken up arms in defiance of the Government: and that the first step toward the punishment of the guilty had already been taken in the suspension of the discussions which were to lead to constitutional changes—*i. e.,* toward the establishment of an Arab Parliament. Or perhaps it is wrong to regard this as punishment. Arab leaders, by their criminal incitement to violence, and Arab mobs by

their susceptibility to such incitement, had simply proved that they could not yet be trusted to administer a country in a civilized manner.

This was the first intimation received by the Jewish population of Palestine that there were British officials, and British statesmen (for the document indicates consultation with the Home Government) who had examined the situation objectively, and had realized that an attitude of "neutrality" did not, in this case, represent justice, but rather concurrence in the lawlessness of certain elements. It is widely reported in Palestine that shortly after the riots broke out in Jerusalem, the Administration approached Rabbi Kook, and asked him to sign a document in which appeared the statement, among others, that civil war had broken out in Palestine. Rabbi Kook indignantly refused: he stated that there was no civil war in Palestine: civil war argues that there are two parties to a conflict; mobs had assaulted the Jewish community, which had been going about its business of reconstruction, with no intention of submitting its disputes with certain Moslems to the judgment of war. Certainly the Palestine Administration would have liked to give the riots an aspect of civil war: it was just this which was needed to cover its own criminal incompetence and the complacent attitude it had adopted

toward the development of needless and irrelevant bitterness in the country.

And even with the return of Sir John Chancellor there was incomprehensible tardiness in the exertion of measures which should strike at the root of the trouble. In *Davar* of September 12 occurs the following report:

"Yesterday a proclamation of the Arab Executive, signed by the President, Musa Kazim Pasha, was circulated in Haifa, stating that the rumor spread in the north of country to the effect that Jews had destroyed the Mosque of Omar or had thrown bombs against it, were untrue. Musa Kazim Pasha states that 'the Mosque is with God's help intact and will forever remain intact in Moslem hands.' "

This is a fine instance of a retraction which by innuendo fortifies a slander: "With God's help intact and will forever remain intact in Moslem hands. . . ." But the retraction, such as it is, came nearly three weeks after the first careful circulation of the slander, and at a time when it could no longer influence the behavior of the criminals, now cowed by the presence of British troops. *Davar* continues:

"This denial of the fables spread by the leaders of our enemies should be considered the result of pressure exerted first by Jewish leaders on the Government, and then by the Government on Arab leaders."

I should be glad to think that the surmise of *Davar* is correct: that the retraction of the slander was the result of Government action; for every indication of Government action in favor of justice and peace is an encouragement to our work. But if the Arab Executive is culpable in having waited nearly three weeks before it checked the further spread of the slander, what shall we say about the Palestine British Administration, which must have been as well informed as the Jewish press which it suppressed as to the circulation of the slander, and as to the effects it was producing in the Arab public mind? And what shall we say of a Government which waited till the suppression of the riots before it issued an order making the spread of inflammatory slanders a criminal offence?

And now, for the benefit of the still sceptical reader, let me recall an extraordinary fact in connection with the riots. Had there been a civil war which the British Government was engaged in suppressing, had the aggression and the plundering been mutual, we should find some factual indication in the records. But though Bulletin No. 6 says, impudently enough: "The search for arms and loot continues in all suspected areas without distinction," there is not adduced a single instance in which loot was found in Jewish colonies or settlements! The Government is compelled to record: "The villages

of Beit Surik and Bidu were searched and a considerable amount of loot taken at Motza was found in Beit Surik. . . . The villages of Lifta and Walajeh were also searched. A number of suspects were arrested." Wherever the language of the bulletins is specific, it reveals that it is on Arab marauders and Arab mobs that the British troops had to fire. Thus it was at Jerusalem, at Jaffa, at Haifa, at Ber Tuvia, at Hattin and elsewhere. The only record I have been able to find of a Jew killed or wounded by British bullets is in Tel Aviv, where an old man found himself accidentally in the line of fire when British troops threw back an Arab mob marching through the mixed quarter into the heart of Tel Aviv. Six Arabs were killed at that point.

In one respect the sentence above, to which I take violent exception (concerning the search for loot and arms in all areas without distinction), is half true: but it is a half truth which reveals one of the most abominable features of the whole abominable business. *Loot* was found only in Arab villages: arms were taken from both Arabs and Jews. A perfect parallel to the situation might be found in a report, let us say, like the following: "Armed mobs yesterday assaulted certain peaceful sections of Chicago, some of which were able to defend themselves, and some of which were freely destroyed and plundered. The civic authorities re-

stored order, and looked for plunder and arms in all sections without discrimination."

Of course the police found arms among the Jews. Had there not been this miserable and insufficient degree of self-defence, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa and the colonies would have suffered the same fate as Hebron and Safed. But until this time of writing (September 16, 1929) the Government treats the possession of arms among marauders and victims as being equally criminal. The founder of Motza (concerning which the Government itself must report, in Bulletin No. 4: "On the morning of August 29th, about seventy Arabs from the village of Qolonia were arrested in connection with the attacks on the Jewish Colony of Motza") is arrested on the denunciation of an Arab. When I left Palestine (September 16) there were forty Jews in the prison at Acre awaiting charges of murder for being in possession of arms. In Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa, and elsewhere, Jews were arrested for being in possession of the means of self-defence. One of the most astonishing cases occurred in the village of Jabniel. The village applied to the Government for protection. Troops were sent to help defend the place — and ten men in the village found in the possession of arms were arrested! Among them was the Mukhtar or head of Jabniel. I do not know

whether the British troops have yet withdrawn from the village. If they have done so (as they have withdrawn from many centres after the passage of the first unrests) the colony will remain absolutely defenceless.

This is neutrality literally with a vengeance. No wonder *Davar* asks, in an excess of despair: "Is there a law which compels men to deliver their lives and the lives of their children to massacre, their daughters to rape, their property to plunder? Did the Government wish to see the acts which occurred in Hebron and Safed repeated against the Jews of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa and the remote Jabniel? What theory and what kind of regime is it that demands such things from men? Did not these people take up arms only to defend their own lives? A great treasure had been entrusted to them, more precious than their lives and their possessions: the last hope of the Jewish nation. What nation dare demand of these chosen emissaries of the Jewish people, who are building up Zion, to deliver Zion into the hands of rioters and murderers?

"Yet . . . these men, who did not attack anybody, who did not assault any settlement, did not set fire to any house, and of course have never raised their hand against the life of a child or the honor of a woman . . . were the first to be tried and sentenced

for the possession of a rusty pistol or small knife. . . ."

. . . . .

One might have thought that the indignant proclamation of Sir John Chancellor, quoted in full above, would put an end to the question of guilt in connection with the assaults. But when I left Palestine a curious controversy had replaced the original question of guilt—a controversy so extraordinary in character, so perverted in purpose, that my astonishment at the vagaries of the human mind begins to displace my feeling of resentment and disgust. In his proclamation the High Commissioner speaks of the "acts of unspeakable savagery" which were committed at Hebron. This is an allusion to the instances of rape and mutilation which occurred there. (It should be noted: in all other places the Arabs carried out the attacks with a mixture of clubs, steel and firearms: at Hebron the slaughter was committed only with cold steel.) The controversy which was engulfing the country, and engaging the ingenuity of the casuists of the British Health Department, centred round the definition of "mutilation." If a man assaults a woman or child with a hatchet or a sword, and chops off fingers, hands, ears, during the assault, has he been guilty of mutilation, or merely of the comparatively honorable

crime of murder? Were the Jews who saw the mutilated (I cannot think of another word) bodies of their wives, mothers, daughters, relatives and friends stretched out in death, justified in using the word mutilation, or were they slandering the chivalrous attackers, who merely ran amuck among the defenceless Jews? Is a mutilation a mutilation when it is performed in the line of duty, so to speak, or is it only an accidental feature of the assault?

It is a ghastly fact that this controversy was thrusting out of the centre of public attention the actual character of the assault, and English officials were now engaged in defending the reputation of the murderers against the infamous allegation of "mutilation." I confess that I am utterly unable to grasp the mentality which lies behind this unclean and frivolous interest in the fine points of the method of murder. Yet I have met it before. I remember long and involved controversies on the subject of the word pogrom—raised by the defenders of Poles and Ukrainians. How many Jews must be killed, how many houses destroyed, before the word pogrom can be used? Can one use the word pogrom when Jews are merely assaulted, beaten and wounded? Or is the word in that case an exaggeration, an assault upon the honor of the attackers?

I repeat that the mentality behind these arguments is beyond me. Not so, however, the motive

which sets this mentality in motion. That motive is so clear that I need not dwell upon it.

. . . . .

It is only after some hesitation that I have decided to introduce into the record the protest of the Arab Executive against Sir John Chancellor's first proclamation. The document is such a queer mixture of self-justification, of denial, and of further incitement to riot, that I shall be suspected of quoting it merely to strengthen the Jewish case. And yet my original intention was to give the Arab point of view.

"Palestine Arabs read with astonishment and regret your Excellency's proclamation dated 1st instant. None anticipated that widely known facts admitted by Government that most Jews were self-armed, that Government armed many Jews, that there were no mutilations among Jewish casualties (casualties!) even at Hebron, as British Health authorities declare, that certain Arabs were mutilated by Jews, that Jewish mobs killed isolated women and children, that first murders of women and children were committed by Jews against Arabs, that even disciplined British soldiers shot Arab men, women and children in their homes and beds at Sour-Baher and elsewhere, that troubles in Palestine, past and present, are directly caused by the

British Zionist policy, which aimed at annihilating the Arab nation in its own country in favor of reviving a non-existent Jewish nation, facts all of which would be thwarted by a hasty untimely proclamation. Your Excellency knows that Palestine Arabs lost everything to fear the loss of anything; therefore British troops will find them unarmed submitting to any havoc. If there remains any sense of justice to which Arabs are entitled, they insist that an impartial inquiry be made by outsiders, whose sense of justice is not curbed by Zionist influence. In the two previous inquiries made in similar conditions, by unbiased British commissions, Arabs gratefully proclaim they were relieved by having their political agonies and noble national aims unfolded. Arabs strongly believe that a similar inquiry will relate to the world a more truthful story of their condition and these troubles than that depicted in this proclamation issued before giving them any chance to be heard. Then the world will see that Jews, whose aggressions have surpassed political aims to religious ones, whose provocations lately became insupportable, as admitted by Government (!), whose atrocities do not fall short of this proclamation's accusation against Arabs, were responsible for the present troubles together with the policy supporting them. This proclamation should have succeeded and not preceded such impartial inquiry,

and we are sure that reconsideration of the situation will lead your Excellency to a more rightful judgment."

It is useless to analyze this document in detail. But certain points should be noted. The demand of the Arab Executive for an impartial commission to look into the guilt of the respective parties, is a cunning perversion of the intention of the Government. The Government does not need an impartial commission to find out who made the assault: the evidence in connection with *this* question is open to those who are on the spot. What the Government intended and intends, is to inquire into the sources of propaganda which led to the outbreak: to determine which side, Jewish or Arab, preached a policy of violence: which side, by misrepresentation and provocation, roused the mobs to action. The declaration of the High Commissioner that the Arabs had committed assault, murder and arson, that mobs had been guilty of acts "of unspeakable savagery" was *not* an anticipation of the findings of the Commission, for it relates to what took place in the open light of day, and not what must be dug out from its secret hiding place.

And now, in closing this chapter, let me revert once more to the worst feature of the whole disaster. No Commission which does not inquire with equal rigor and impartiality into the statements,

utterances and policies of the three parties: the Arabs, the Jews and the Administration, will be of any avail. I have given a single instance of what an administration should have done (*i.e.,* compel the Arab Executive *in time* to deny the widespread rumor of the bombing of the Mosque of Omar). An effective commission will have to find out, among other things, why the Palestine Administration permitted the building of the entrance into the Wailing Wall: why it treated the Arabs with encouraging leniency and the Jews with unjust severity: why it persistently under-reported Arab assaults and demonstrations, and exaggerated peaceful Jewish demonstrations; why, during the assault on the Jews, it did not try to bring the Arab population to its senses by drawing a sharp distinction between assaulters and assaulted: why it failed to arrest the Governor of Hebron: why it disarmed the assaulted: why it armed only forty Jews in Jerusalem when the entire Jewish population was threatened with massacre, and then disarmed them thirty-six hours later, while the assaults were still continuing: why, in Jerusalem, it gave orders to the troops not to shoot at the rioters—an order which held good for twenty-four hours. These are only some of the questions which an impartial commission must investigate in fixing the blame for the outbreak and the continuation of the riots. Unless these questions are effectively an-

swered, unless British officials are, on these specific questions, either cleared of all guilt or dismissed from their posts, the troubles in Palestine will continue indefinitely.

I have made it clear that in my opinion, in the opinion of all Jews, *and in the opinion of some Arabs,* the British Administration in Palestine deliberately pursued a policy which encouraged Arabs to appeal against the building of the Jewish homeland by staging a riot. For a long time we have heard of the reluctance of British officials in Palestine to obey the terms of the Mandate, which speaks of the facilitation of the building of a Jewish National Home. We have heard of petty and major obstacles placed in our way; of acts of anti-Semitism (more accurately, of anti-Jewishness); of perpetual annoyances. I have referred to none of these accusations. I have based myself almost exclusively on events which occurred during my stay in the country, and on Government documents relating to these events. And on the basis of this examination I take it upon myself to state that in the British Administration in Palestine the preponderance of power lies with a group which is opposed to the Mandate, which seeks to negate in detail what the Mandate proclaims in principle. With such an administration it is not only futile to speak of a Jewish homeland

being built up, according to the recorded wish of the British nation and of all the other civilized nations of the world; it is even futile to hope for the safety of the beginnings of that homeland created with infinite toil and infinite idealism by the Jews who have gone to Palestine and by the Jews who have helped them throughout the world.

CHAPTER X

The Protest of the Jews of Palestine

THE reader is now in a position to follow in detail the contents of the Memorandum of the Jewish National Institutions (The Jewish National Council, the Chief Rabbinate, and the Central Agudath Israel—representing the Sephardic Jews) submitted to the High Commissioner on September 2nd, 1929. I reproduce it in extenso because it is a careful summary of the recent events in Palestine. By itself it is too general to be followed by those not acquainted with the detailed history of the events. That history I have tried to supply up to this point.

"Your Excellency:

"It is premature at this juncture to summarize the events of the last ten days of bloodshed which have destroyed a considerable part of the work of reconstruction of two generations and have resulted in one hundred and thirty Jews killed and several hundreds wounded. We have not yet the confidence that these events have come to an end. We still hear, day and night, of new victims, of new settlements attacked. But we, the representatives of the Jewish

community in Palestine, deem it our duty to submit to your Excellency on your return to the country, our conclusions concerning the bloodshed and destruction which have occurred to this day, and to present our most urgent demands.

"1. For some considerable time past there has been conducted in the country a systematic propaganda, both secret and open, for an attack upon the Jews, who are engaged in a work of peace and reconstruction. In 1921 the authors of this propaganda spread within the Moslem masses fears and apprehensions as to their land, their possessions and their women-folk. Realizing that on religious grounds they would find it easier to incite the Moslem masses, the instigators have now chosen the Wailing Wall as a starting point. One of the principal instigators of the Jerusalem riots of 1921, who was subsequently privileged to be appointed by the Government as President of the Supreme Moslem Council, the Mufti of Jerusalem, appears now as defender of Moslem sanctuaries against our supposed attacks. The propaganda has now been thoroughly organized. All this was done before the very eyes of the Government on which rests the responsibility for the security of the country and the welfare of its people. The Government has done nothing to suppress this instigation and to anticipate its consequences. This strange indifference

on the part of a civilized and strong Government, which knows how to use its force when it wills, strengthens in us the conviction that in Government quarters there are forces which have an interest in this incitement and in the encouragement of disputes between the peoples and communities of this country.

"2. Ever since the Wailing Wall incident of last Yom Kippur, which shook the Jewish world by the rude infringement of our national sanctuary, carried out by the order of the Deputy District Commissioner of Jerusalem, we have repeatedly warned the Government of the danger to the peace of the country involved in the attitude which it adopted: an attitude which ignored the continual violation of Jewish rights and which played into the hands of those who defied our rights and our dignity; but the Government has continued to increase the danger and to render it more imminent by authorizing the construction of additional layers on the Wall, and the opening of a new gate, all of which turned the Wailing Wall Place into a public thoroughfare.

"3. The Government has not troubled, either before the outbreak of the riots, or subsequently, to deny the lies and slanders which the instigators have circulated within the Moslem masses, and to confirm the relations of peace and honor which govern the

attitude of the Jewish community toward the Arab nation and their sanctuaries.

"4. Before the outbreak of the riots, the Government took steps which led the Moslems to suppose that it, the Government, is privy to their apprehensions and supports their movement:

"It permitted the Moslem demonstration in the Wailing Wall Place as though there had been any Jew who had attacked the Mosque. It published an official statement which compared the Arab demonstration at a Jewish place of worship with the demonstration of a few scores of the Jewish youth on Tisha b'Ab, the Jewish national day of mourning, at their own place of worship. While the demonstration of the few scores of young Jews interfered with no one and made no attack of any kind, the Moslem demonstration profaned the Jewish place of worship by acts of desecration, by the burning of Jewish prayer books and psalters, and by the breaking of devotional objects; no one, however, was arrested or punished for these crimes. And the Government, in its Official Communiqué, has the intention of overlooking these acts and of minimizing their significance.

"5. During the first days of the riots, the Jewish community, which suffered a general attack, was deprived of all Government defence. In most cases police forces came too late, and after the rioters

had done their work. In many cases the police was a passive onlooker, and failed to intervene. To all the warnings of the Jewish community, and their calls for urgent help, the Government had one reply: 'The Government has the situation in hand.'

"6. We are fully convinced that, by immediate and energetic measures, it was possible to suppress the riots at their very beginning. On that black day in Jerusalem, Friday, August 23, the Government took no such measures. The attack on Jerusalem was at the commencement a local incident apparently designed to test the attitude of the Government toward the rioters. After Friday services, Moslem masses left the Mosque and began isolated attacks on Jews, firing, throwing stones, breaking windows, etc. The Government failed to respond to this attack, having posted a few Arab and English policemen who for the most part were armed with clubs. The few armored cars which patrolled the streets did not touch the assailants. The police did not try to disperse or to repel the first assailants, and the masses of rioters immediately felt that they had nothing to fear in the way of serious intervention on the part of the Government.

"7. The Jews defended themselves as best they could. Only thanks to the Jewish defence were the first assaults on the Old City, Romema, Meah Shearim, Nachlath Achim, Rechavia, Talpioth,

Yemin Moshe, Sanhedria, Machnayim, Bait ve-Gan, Beth ha-Kerem, Montefiore, Givath Saul and the Georgian quarter repelled. The Government did not trouble to send immediate help in good time either to these or to the Diskin Orphanage and Asylum of three hundred boys, who would have been exposed to butchery had not the adjacent quarters rushed to their defence.

"8. On Saturday, at 6 a.m., simultaneous firing was heard in all parts of the city. The attackers aimed at the destruction of Kiriath Anavim, the Sanatorium Arza, Motza, Atarot, and all the outlying quarters of Jerusalem: they looted several houses in Talpioth, Mekor Chaim, Bait ve-Gan, Nevei and Shaanan, and endeavored to set fire to them. This time, too, the City was saved mainly thanks to the defence of Jerusalem Jews in all places of danger. But for this defence there would have been here, too, the butchery of Hebron and the massacre of Safed. We must mention with praise and gratitude the Oxford men and the British officials who volunteered that day to defend the attacked, and valiantly and faithfully discharged this duty. But not all the attacked settlements were able to hold their own with the forces at their disposal. Thus the Bait ve-Gan quarter was looted and destroyed. The Girls' Settlement near the new High Commissioner's residence, and the G'dud ha-Avo-

dah on Ramath Rachel met with the same fate. In this settlement the residents defended themselves till their forces gave out, and when the settlement fell, the way was open for the attack on Talpioth. The courage and the rapacity of the assailants increased, and their field of action widened, thanks to the inactivity of the Government, and spread from Jerusalem to the other parts of the country.

"9. The Government permitted the attack to expand, and during all these days of horror took no serious measures for the safety of our lives and property. No serious penalties were imposed on the rioters. The special conditions proclaimed in the country passed the attackers by. No fines were imposed on those who looted Jewish property, as though the looting of it was lawful. The Government has neither arrested nor tried any one of the principal agitators who alone are responsible for the bloodshed and for the destruction of the settlements. Officers of the Government whose responsibility for the events is beyond doubt have to this day neither been dismissed from their posts nor committed for trial.

"10. The guilt of the officers of the Government was expressed at its worst in the butchery at Hebron. On Friday groups of Arabs roamed through the streets of Hebron, and threw stones at Jewish houses; they tried to break into the houses; they

killed a student of the Yeshivah: these were the obvious indications of the butchery which impended, yet nothing was done for the defence of the Jews of Hebron. And before the eyes of the Governor, to whom alarm calls were sent, but without response, before the eyes of the policemen, who had been armed only with batons, this horrible butchery was carried out on sixty-three men, women and children, Rabbis and students of the law, a butchery without equal in the history of this country since the destruction of the Temple, and one which could have been promptly suppressed by a few shots fired in the air.

"11. Even one week after the beginning of the bloodshed, and after Your Excellency's return to the country, the atrocities and barbarities of Hebron were repeated in Safed; an old Jewish city with thousands of Jewish residents was burned, looted and destroyed before the eyes of the Government, who watched it without affording the proper aid and defence.

"12. Other links in this chain of destruction are the murders committed in the Jewish settlement of Beisan, the mass attacks on Tel Aviv and Haifa, the assaults on the southern colonies, the destruction of Ber Tuvia, the burning of Artuf, Hulda and Kfar Uriah, and the heroic resistance offered by Gederah against its assailants. After the butchery of the Jews of Safed, the danger in Upper Galilee

increased, as in the colonies of Lower Galilee and of the Jordan Valley. Fire was set to most of their crops which are now exposed to attacks and raids, without assurance of what the morrow will bring.

"13. In view of this situation, and in view of the net of organized attacks thrown round all the colonies of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, the first duty of the Government should have been to strengthen the hands of the men who were in danger, to put sufficient means of defence at their disposal, to organize and to support their self-defence so that innocent blood might not be shed and the work of generations not laid waste. But what has the Government been doing, and what is it doing now? It has prosecuted and is still prosecuting those Jews who defend themselves. It disarms them, arrests them and commits them for trial as ordinary offenders.

"14. The Government suspended the telephone communications between the various towns of the country: this suspension applied not only to individuals, but also institutions (the Zionist Executive and a few isolated institutions excepted). In effect, this meant that the Government denied the people the possibility of making a direct appeal for immediate help. The Government imposed a severe censorship on all telegrams abroad and delayed their transmission. The Government prohibited the publication

of newspapers, regardless as to whether newspapers in question were engaged in instigating riot or in working for peace. All this made for an increase both of the feeling of fear and of the danger, inasmuch as the Jews found themselves not only deprived of arms for self-defence, and of the help and protection of the Government, but were also unable to appeal to each other, or to anyone else, for help; they were deprived of the possibility of securing the help of their correligionists in other parts of the world, and were unable to give the lie to the calumnies circulated by their enemies both here and abroad.

"15. In the midst of the quiet work of peace and reconstruction, a work which oppressed no individual and no community, inflamed mobs were sent against us; they shed the blood of hundreds of people, subjected many to unspeakable tortures, butchered children, raped women, desecrated synagogues, burned holy books, and destroyed considerable property, the fruit of the great labors of the Jewish people throughout the diaspora. For ten days the Jewish community found itself exposed to murder and destruction, and it is still within the shadow of that danger. Although the picture of the events was so clear and obvious, the Government has attempted in its official communications, published during the very days of bloodshed, to depict the events as a

strife between two races, in which it is not clear who was the attacker and who the attacked. In this attempt to distort the truth concerning these events, we see not only an attempt against our lives and welfare, but an attack on our dignity, and an intention to present to the world a distorted picture of the character of our community, which from its founding here has cherished the ideal of peaceful and honorable relations with all religions and races. This distortion of the truth is an inevitable epilogue to the plan of destruction which was only partially realized thanks to the Jewish self-defence."

CHAPTER XI

The Southern Colonies

I HAVE reported the Jerusalem attack in detail because the behavior of the British administration and the crippled self-defence of the Jews give a fair picture of the situation; I have reported the attack on Tel Aviv because I was an eyewitness of part of it, and because in no urban part of Palestine is the contrast between Jewish creativeness and Arab *laissez faire* so sharply symbolized. Nothing will be added to the reader's knowledge of the situation by a description of the Haifa riots. Here were mingled the features of both Tel Aviv and Jerusalem: incompetence or indifference on the part of the Administration; self-defence on the part of the Jews half balked by the refusal of the Administration to recognize openly that one part of the population was attacking, one part was defending. The details are monotonous to those who have followed the narratives of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. I only ought to add that in Haifa the Jewish self-defence was, in spite of the hostility of the Administration, fairly effective.

But the defence of the Jewish colonies, in the

south, and in the Emek, cannot be spoken of without a brief introduction on the subject of the men and women who occupy these dangerous posts. I have spoken of the courage of the Jewish colonists. I do not wish the reader to invest that word with a touch of adventurousness. The young Jews who went into lonely places and brought fruitfulness into the wilderness, are not to be confused with the conquistador type, in whom a delight in danger for its own sake mingles with other motives. These are not men who find a thrill in danger; who seek trouble when it does not come of itself, and create it when they cannot find it. This sort of courage is not Jewish in general; and it is specifically alien to these men and women, who are moved by a serious, almost a sombre, will to build up a pure world of their own; to live in peace with their neighbors; to re-establish a specifically Jewish civilization; and to find peace of soul in the daily routine of economic and spiritual creation. They have no delight in fighting; they regard conflict as something primitive and revolting. They will not retreat from danger—but they make no pretence of enjoying it. They are not mediæval romanticists, and their philosophy is not that of the Bedouin, who regards the sword and the rifle as the symbols of manhood. For this primitive nonsense the young Jews of the Palestinian colonies have neither time nor inclination. Perhaps this Jewish

type of courage, unbarbarian, adult, silent, unboastful, and somewhat disgusted, is not as appealing as the "red-blooded" (is not that the usual adjective?) courage of the primitive peoples of the East and West. But I am not trying to rouse the military pride of Jews, or thrill the world with a story of physical daring and joyous recklessness of danger. We are occupied with more important things in Palestine.

And in speaking of the colonies, I am glad to be able to introduce another tone, too. The record of Hebron contains instances of generous help extended by Arabs to Jews, at great personal risk. In a special chapter I have collected a number of such incidents, partly because the world should know that the Arabs of Palestine are not a bloodthirsty and treacherous people; and partly because these many instances indicate what can be done, and has been done, in the way of creating friendship between Arabs and Jews. But in the attacks on the colonies the instances of friendly acts, warnings, protection, are so numerous that they give a special character to the story. The Jewish colonies are of course infinitely more exposed than the Jewish cities (Hebron and Safed excepted); yet in spite of many ferocious attacks the loss of life in the colonies was extremely small. This was due in some instances to the friendliness of surrounding villages (the attackers usually came from a distance). In other places it was due to

the grim, intelligent and unflinching Jewish self-defence. I cannot reproduce in this book the full record of the defence: it would serve no purpose here. That part of the record which I set down I have chosen for its illustrative character.

The small colony Hulda lies on a hill in the center of the Herzl forest, which comes up to the doors of the buildings. It is surrounded by Arab villages. The nearest railway station (Valley of Surek) is two kilometers away. Like many other colonies in Palestine, Hulda is isolated. It depends for its safety on the friendliness of the Arabs, and, when this fails, on the courage and ability of the colonists.

Friday and Saturday, the 23rd and 24th of August, when Jerusalem, Motza, Hebron and other points had suffered attack, Hulda was still quiet. But the colonists were not at ease. In spite of the long record of friendship with the surrounding Arabs, they began to think of the organization of the defences. Kfar Uriah, not far off, was already a storm center. And on Saturday they sent word to Tel Aviv that they needed help.

Sunday afternoon ten young men left Tel Aviv by automobile, and rushed southward through Rechoboth. At the Arab village of Ajur, beyond Rechoboth, an attempt was made to stop the machine, and shots were fired at it, but the chauffeur put on

speed and rushed through the crowd. One Arab, more daring than the rest, leapt onto the dashboard, and would not jump off till threatened with a pistol. The automobile passed by Ekron, through the Arab village of Mensurah. There the Arabs had blocked the road with planks and stones. The one hope of the rescuers was to smash through the blockade. The skill and coolness of the driver, which is praised by all the members of the party to whom I have spoken, got them through. On Sunday night the party got through to Hulda.

Sunday night passed in peace. But on Monday morning came the first signs of immediate trouble. The two Arab policemen who usually made the rounds of the district failed to turn up that morning. At eleven o'clock the watchers in the colony saw an automobile arrive in the Arab village of Hulda. It remained there till about three in the afternoon, and a restlessness spread through the village. Crowds gathered round the machine. The Bedouins who camp on the hills opposite the colony folded their tents and disappeared. At six o'clock the watchers saw crowds of Arabs coming down the slopes toward the hill of the colony. Two men who had gone to the station to telephone to Tel Aviv for news were fired on as they returned. It was now clear that the attack would be made that night.

As soon as darkness fell the attack began. The

Arabs advanced in a large semi-circle, their intent being to enclose both the house and the threshing floor. When they were fairly close, a group of five men, with torches in their hands, rushed for the threshing floor. The colonists opened fire on them, but the Arabs got through, and set fire to the grain. The defenders were divided into two groups, one stationed in the house, the other in the yard enclosing the sheds.

After the riots of 1921, the Government had placed, in some colonies, a number of rifles in sealed boxes which were to be opened only in extreme danger. In Hulda the box was opened that night. It contained six rifles. Had the colonists been compelled to depend on this supply, Hulda would have been wiped out. But the men who came from Tel Aviv had brought arms. And it was possible for a time to conduct a defence from two places—the house and the yard.

The defence of the yard was under the command of Ephraim Chisik. (His sister, Sarah, had been killed in the defence of Tel Hai eight years before, when Joseph Trumpeldor and his companions fell.) Late that evening it became evident that under a heavy attack it was dangerous to split the forces. It was decided (as in many other colonies) to give up the defence of the property, and defend only human life. Chisik therefore commanded his men to leave

the yard, and crawl along the path, covered on both sides with a wire hedge, which led from the yard to the house. Chisik went last. All the men got through —except Chisik. He had almost reached the house when a bullet struck him in the side. He was brought in and laid down. Two hours later he was dead.

The attacks lasted three hours—from a little after six until a little after nine. A member of the defence, with whom I spoke, estimated the number of men in the first attack at four hundred. The defenders numbered thirty-seven. According to my informant, the surrounding Arab villages could not have furnished so large a number of attackers. The majority of them must have come from a distance. In the second attack he estimated there must have been close on a thousand—but among the voices yelling in the darkness could be heard those of women and children.

At nine o'clock there came a lull. The threshing floor was blazing fiercely. It was visible that evening in Tel Aviv—and must also have been visible in Naaneh, where British troops were stationed. Nevertheless, three hours passed between the lighting of this fire and the arrival of the British.

In the lull, the defenders heard a whistling, and a shouting in English. The shouts were "We've come to help you." But the defenders feared that this was merely a ruse. After a conference, one man volun-

teered to go out and investigate. He found, near the threshing floor, two Arab policemen and four Englishmen. Calling back to the defenders to hold their fire, he brought the group into the house. Soon after, the Arabs renewed the attack, and now the English helped in the defence. This time the attack was made in mass formation, so that the fire of colonists took heavy toll. Above the shouting of the attackers could be heard the screaming of the wounded. The attack was beaten off, and now the English decided to return to Naaneh for reinforcements. Recalling the first tardiness of the English in sending help, the colonists insisted that two of the English remain behind. The others got through in the lull.

About this time the Arabs, apparently despairing of taking the house by storm, set fire to the forest at several points—but fortunately the trees burned very slowly. From about nine till midnight the attacks continued, though with weakening force. And at midnight they stopped altogether. The defenders heard the firing of a machine gun and rockets went up into the air. An armored car and three automobiles with British soldiers had arrived.

The commanding officer, speaking in German, told the colonists that he had orders to evacuate them. The men were reluctant to go—for they knew what the fate of their possessions would be once the place was abandoned. But the officer insisted either

on carrying out the command, or on abandoning the men to their fate. It was a difficult moment. The factor which weighed most heavily with them, however, was the burning of the forest. The fire was spreading very slowly, but it was spreading. And there was every danger that if they remained alone, and could not venture out of the house, the Arabs would make a thorough job of the fire, and force them into the open. Close after midnight the men abandoned the colony. They tried to take the body of Ephraim Chisik with them, but the English officer would not permit it. He frustrated an attempt to smuggle the body into one of the cars, and Chisik was left there.

Round the house which they abandoned they saw the bodies of some of the attackers—between forty and fifty dead men. Many more must have fallen, but had been carried away. My informant (one of the men who had gone out from Tel Aviv to help the defence) said the English officer had been astonished by the intelligence and courage of the colonists. During the time when the English were in the house, helping in the defence, the officer found nothing to correct in the dispositions taken by the colonists.

From midnight, Monday, till nine o'clock on Tuesday, the colonists remained in the house of the

Governor at Ramleh. And on Tuesday morning they came into Tel Aviv.

The defence of Hulda illustrates a number of points. First, it is the opinion of the colonists that only a consistent secret propaganda could have led to this attack, for the relations between Jew and Arab had been cordial. Second, the means of defence left by the Government at the disposal of the colonists were just enough to irritate rather than keep off an attacking mob. Third, the British forces at Naaneh, who must have seen the fires lit by the Arabs, were inexplicably slow in coming to the rescue.

. . . . .

In addition to reading the reports of witnesses of the defence of Artuf, I obtained a personal account (as in other cases) from some of the colonists. Two residents of Artuf told me their story. One of them was Judah Eppel, a Jew of seventy-three, who had come out from Vilna seven years ago. He did not remember me, but when I reminded him how we had met, in 1919, in Vilna, when I had been employed in the American commission investigating the pogroms which had taken place in Poland, he remarked bitterly: "I don't suppose you thought, in those days, that you would also be investigating pogroms in the Jewish homeland before

very long." Of all the remarks I have heard in Palestine this one struck me, at the time, as containing the sharpest reproach against the British Administration. A man of sixty-six, disgusted with the lack of protection which he had found under an anti-Semitic Polish Government, decides to throw in his lot with those who were building a Jewish homeland; accepts the promise of England that she will be an active, benevolent partner in the enterprise; and finds himself, at seventy-three, exposed to extreme danger, driven out of his home—because representatives of mighty England have been disloyal to the pledge of their people.

Judah Eppel told me many interesting facts concerning the attack on Artuf. The relations between the Jews and the Arabs had been cordial. Even on Friday night, August 23rd, relations had remained normal. Arabs who were working for him, and whom he owed several days' pay, did not ask for their money. The Sheikh of neighboring Yishua, Abd Massauda, had come over on Friday to negotiate contracts for work for his people. Abdullah Mahmoud, the Sheikh of Zara, sent two loads of straw that day, and though there was money already owing him for previous deliveries, made no mention of pay.

Leon Judah Behar, the Mukhtar of the Jewish settlement of Artuf, reported, like Judah Eppel, that

no trouble had ever been expected from their neighbors. But on Thursday Behar was in Jerusalem and learned that trouble was brewing. Returning from Jerusalem, Behar (who has been in the country since the age of four, and speaks a perfect Arabic) conversed with Arab travellers. They told him that letters of the Mufti had gone the rounds of the villages, calling on all Arabs who had any honor, to be present in Jerusalem on Friday. But that night, when he asked the Arab Mukhtar of Artuf whether he had received any such letter, the answer was, No.

But on Friday evening two Arabs came down to Artuf, from Jerusalem, and reported that there had been a great struggle between Arabs and Jews round the Jaffa Gate. And Friday night there were strange Arabs about the place. Judah Eppel was attacked by one of them, fought him off, and ran back to his house. And during the night one of the houses was attacked, and the attackers were fired on and fled.

Saturday there was a coming and going of automobiles through the Arab village of Artuf. Behar spoke with one of the Sheikhs, Yusef Machasin, who admitted that men had come down from Jerusalem and were stirring up trouble. Behar asked him what he thought would happen, and the Sheikh replied: "There are rich men in Jerusalem who are trying to stir up trouble, and we, the poor, will pay for it afterwards. But if there is a Government, nothing

will happen, for it all depends on the Government." On Saturday morning, at ten o'clock, an Arab notable of Bethar, Abd el Rachim Abu Naama, came to the Jews of Artuf. He told them that he knew of the trouble that was brewing in the country. He had come down this way hoping to keep things quiet, but to warn the Jews at the same time. Then he went out into the villages, and returned to the Jews in the evening, saying he could not vouch for their safety now, for there were men from Hebron scattered through the Arab villages, rousing the spirit of the people.

But now the Jews were extremely anxious. They had relied implicitly on their friendly relations with the Arabs; even in the riots of 1921 Arab friends had turned up with offers of help and protection, and nothing had befallen them. Now the danger seemed more serious. The Jews therefore sent for the elders of the Arab village of Artuf, and the latter came. The Jews said: "Is it true that you Arabs intend to attack us?" The reply of the Arabs was: "Whatever you ask of us, we will do for you. If you wish, you can take refuge in our mosque."

The Jews decided to accept this offer, and at seven in the evening they set out—men, women and children—for the Arab village. But half way they were met by messengers, who told them it was dangerous to proceed. For Artuf was now filled with strangers,

and the inhabitants of Artuf could not make themselves responsible for the safety of the Jews.

"We now saw," went on Behar, "that there was no one to rely on but ourselves. So we gathered—one hundred and twenty-five men, women and children—in the biggest house in the colony, that of Yitzchak Levy. While we were there, we received a visit from the Mukhtar of the Arab village of Artuf. He told us now that he had received letters—and so had the Sheikhs of other villages—from Sammi Effendi, son of Musa Kazim Pasha, President of the Arab Executive. In the letter was written: 'Go up to Jerusalem, with arms, for there is no prohibition against arms now on the part of the Government.' This Mukhtar, Abd el Fatah Haj Izmahin, promised to show me the letter afterwards; he had not brought it with him then.

"We sent a Jew to the railroad station of Artuf to telephone to Jerusalem for help. But help did not come till six hours later.

"Toward eight in the evening the attacks began. There were in the colony five sealed rifles provided by the Government; there had once been ten, but the Government had taken away five. We decided to defend only our lives, and let our possessions be plundered. At first the attack was made on the house and we drove the Arabs back. But when the Arabs saw that the rest of the colony was open to them,

they busied themselves with plundering and paid little attention to us. Only now and then shots were exchanged. At twelve-thirty came two British armored cars, but the officer in command said that he could stay only half an hour. The soldiers sent up rockets and dispersed the Arabs. We asked the soldiers to remain with us till morning. But at the end of the half hour they left. The hours passed in silence. At four in the morning we decided it would be best to leave in the darkness and silence, for we were sure that with the morning the attack would be renewed. We felt that conditions in the country must be very bad if even in Artuf they attacked us. So we went out in the night, one hundred and twenty-five of us, carrying the children and the sick, and made our way to the railroad station. We met not a soul on the way. At six o'clock in the morning, when we had settled ourselves in the train, we saw, from the surrounding villages, a line of Arabs, with horses, donkeys and carriages, going up to Artuf. We knew what that meant. While on the way to Jerusalem, we sent a telegram asking that a guard be sent to Artuf, to protect our property. But nothing was done, for we have heard since that the Arabs took everything."

. . . . .

I have reproduced this account in some detail, to illustrate that decent human relations have been

built up between Jews and Arabs, and that only insistent interference from the outside had disturbed these relations. That interference went on under the nose of the Government—and nothing was done to put an end to it. The same story comes from Kfar Uriah. The account of what took place in that settlement, with its thirty souls, I obtained from the Jewish Mukhtar, Baruch Yakimovsky, who has been nine years in the country, the last six of them in Kfar Uriah. Again the story of local friendship, of offers of help, of letters from the outside, of strangers who came with orders to stir up trouble. Sheikh Ismain Milhem, of the neighboring village of Chirbah Betfar, took the Jews under his protection, sheltered them and saved them. But the settlement was abandoned, and the Jews, safe in Chirbah Betfar, saw the place being plundered and burned. The majority of the plunderers were from neighboring villages—for one of them was caught and revealed names. They had not been willing to attack the Jews, but the temptation of unprotected booty was too strong for them.

. . . . .

On Sunday a conference took place between the Jews of Ekron and the notables of the Arab village of Ajur. Both parties alluded to the long record of good relations between them. When the Jews asked why the automobile which had rushed through Ajur

bringing help to Huldah had been fired on, the Arabs replied that the shots had been fired wild of set purpose, in order that the village might keep up appearances *vis-à-vis* the propagandists who had come and were inciting the villagers to attack the Jews. All the Arab villages of that district were being visited by these propagandists. On Monday the colony sent a delegation to the British station at Naaneh. The commander was absent. The officer in charge (who had formerly been a guide in the employ of Cook's) received the delegation brutally. He refused to offer any advice as to how the Jews were to defend their lives and property. Asked what was to be done with the cattle, he said, "Put them in the synagogue." And when the Jewish physician of Ekron pressed him for a sensible answer, he boxed his ears. The colony, shaken by this behavior on the part of the officer who was supposed to protect them, decided to leave the place, and the majority of them went down to the railroad station. At four in the afternoon, the same officer appeared with a guard, and demanded all the weapons in the place. In vain the settlers pleaded that a few men be left there with arms, to protect the property, to feed the chickens, and so on. The officers would not listen. Ekron was abandoned, and the inhabitants were removed to Tel Aviv.

. . . . .

The stories of Ber Tuvia and Gaza are supplements to the pictures I have already given: outside provocation, the disturbance of old relations, attacks by some Arabs, manly and heroic friendliness on the part of others. A minor epic may be written round the defence of Ber Tuvia, where five young men (there were only five rifles in the place—this was the protection offered, under seal, by the Government) held a fierce mob at bay. Two Jews were killed there, one of them the doctor of the place, Chaim Israeli, and the other Zvi Rosen. In Gaza the Jews escaped without casualties, and reached Tel Aviv in safety. The Jews of Gaza remember with gratitude the behavior of Saud Effendi el Shauah and his two sons, Al ez Din and Saadi, who accompanied the cars in which the refugees made their way to the police station, and at the peril of their lives fought off the inflamed mob. Their names, like those of many others, will long be remembered with honor by the Jews; and I do not doubt that when the nest of trouble-makers in Palestine has been cleaned out by a more interested Administration, and when the spirit of quiet will have returned to the country, Arabs too will be glad to remember the names of men who by their behavior rescued the reputation of their fellow-countrymen from utter infamy.

CHAPTER XII

The Emek and the North

I HAD hoped, at the end of a two months' stay in Tel Aviv, to make a leisurely tour of the Valley of Jezreel (the Emek, as they call it in Palestine), to renew my acquaintance with the settlements I had visited five years ago, and to see for myself the changes that were so widely spoken of. I had timed my tour to coincide with the visit of the Ohel theatre, which was to give a performance of Jeremiah in one of the central settlements, and I had hoped to witness one of those strange, symbolic scenes which catch, in a single gesture, the unique spirit of the upbuilding of Palestine: an earnest and profound presentation of a great play in a place which was desolation half a generation ago: by artists who were a conscious part of the reconstruction: before an audience which a few years ago was scattered throughout the Western World, and which today feels itself bound forever to the soil it has reawakened to fruitfulness. It was true that I wanted to see the play a second time, for its own sake; but I wanted still more to see, in the vast setting of this valley of Armageddon, the juncture of

these forces which represent the most creative elements in Jewry: intellectual, spiritual and physical forces liberated and put into action by one hope and one desire.

But the tour I had so lovingly planned never came off. Instead, at about the time I had had in mind, I went in a quick rush through the Emek, Northern Galilee, and the Jordan valley. Instead of the atmosphere of peace and calm labor, I found a tension and expectancy which were the aftermath of the outbreaks. It was less than two weeks after the first riots. The danger was not yet past. And a spirit which I had not known on my first visit now brooded over the colonies. Watches were set in the night, and labor was interrupted by the new tasks of defence.

There was a time, not many years ago, when the pioneers of the Emek and Upper Galilee, the *halutzim,* were the playboys of Jewish imagination. We who lived in the Western World did them the injustice of dramatizing them, of setting them up as romantic models of industry, fortitude and courage —making them the scapegoats of our own unimaginative lives: so that an outsider would have been inclined to approach them with suspicion, as intelligent people approach all objects of unintelligent adoration. Later we did them a greater injustice: we forgot them altogether. We were caught up in the enthusiasm of industrial and economic construc-

tion. We suddenly perceived that pioneers were quite good in their way, but that the Western technique of production and business would be the real salvation of Palestine. Which is half true, of course: but there had been no call for the frothy enthusiasm of the first recognition, and no excuse for the condescension of the later point of view. Fortunately the pioneers of the Emek and the Galilees, Upper and Lower, were not taken off their feet by our first silly praises, nor upset by our later disdain. They were not playing to a gallery.

Yet, though I seem to be reverting to the first sin again, I cannot help confessing that a strange, fierce pride in these men and women gripped me, when I looked back from the foothills below Nazareth, and saw the panorama of the villages, with their red roofs, in their seas of green. And a fiercer pride rose in me when I stood in Kfar Gileadi, and saw from the slope the great stretches of the Hula swamps: ours is the only permanent assertion of human power over nature in this desolate place. In the Hula the miserable huts and tents of Bedouins, of wretched reed-weavers, come and go. They are not the masters of the desolation, but its victims. We alone have set the stamp of conquest on the intractable district.

Kfar Gileadi and Tel Hai—two names which already have a legendary sound in Palestine—were

founded only twelve years ago. They were the first *kvutzoth* or co-operative settlements, to be tried by the PICA (Palestine Jewish Colonization Association), or, to be more exact, by Baron Rothschild. But the conservative hand of this administration was forced to the radical enterprise because of the nature of the task. A special human material was needed for the colonization of this repellent and dangerous area—and that material existed, perhaps quite naturally, among young men and women who were caught up in a certain social ideal. There was in Palestine, before the war, a group of young Jews called Ha-Shomer—an association for self-defence. In those days of general lawlessness no colony could be without its guards, and the Jewish Shomer is a figure who has already passed into the swiftly moving history of Palestinian life.

The Ha-Shomer group had a character of its own. The members were tied together by a bond which can be best described to the Western World as the bond of a religious knighthood: but that description must be stripped of its suggestion of aggression and search for adventure. These were not adventurers. Nor were they monks and preachers. The religious element spoke through a belief in a certain order of society. But they did not wish to impose their views on others. They wished only to live according to their views.

When the Ha-Shomer went up to colonize the places now known as Tel Hai and Kfar Gileadi, they had as neighbors one older Jewish settlement, Metullah—an individualist settlement—and fierce Bedouin tribes which came and went over the eastern border, half an hour away. The nearest larger Jewish settlement was in the town of Safed, a day's distance by cart. A more stubborn enemy than the Bedouins was the Hula swamp, which begins at the foot of the hills on which the two colonies stand.

The history of Tel Hai and Kfar Gileadi proved that the PICA had chosen its human material well. For in 1920, when trouble broke out in the area of the French mandate, to the north, the two colonies were put to a severe test, which meant either retreat and loss of the positions, or a desperate battle with overwhelming numbers. The settlers chose the second alternative. It was in this famous encounter that Joseph Trumpeldor and his companions fell. But the two settlements have lived in peace since then. No Arab band dared attack them during the present disturbances. For the men of Tel Hai and Kfar Gileadi are known as desperate fighters. They will die in their places but not retreat: and booty is too dearly obtained at such a price.

When I last saw the colonies, in 1924, I was startled by the grimness of the life which these men and women had taken upon themselves. It is impos-

sible to describe the sense of isolation and darkness which hung about the place. It seemed as though these men and women, instead of playing a part in the reconstruction of a nation, had withdrawn from all human contact to the most forbidding retreat they could discover, sundering themselves as if forever from their own people and from all the peoples of the world. There were only three stone buildings in Kfar Gileadi then. Today there are two rows of neat, happy looking houses. Between the two rows of houses fruit trees are planted. A little forest of eucalyptus grows to one side. Kfar Gileadi is cheerful. Five years ago it was part of the desolation. Today it stands out of it. There are thirty-two children in the colony now—the majority of them born on the place. They played about the plantation and the miniature forest while the council of the colony was conferring with Colonel Kisch, who had taken myself and Dr. Samuel Margoshes of the "Day" on this swift round. The children interested me more than their parents—for these were the children I had had in mind when the problem of my own children perplexed me: children brought up in the waste, sundered from the seething Western World in which we think it is so important for us to live. They were not like the children of English or French peasants that I had seen: nor like the children of American villages. In Kfar Gile-

adi there is both a kindergarten and a school—and in both the standard is as high as may be found in most Western cities. The brutishness of the soil is not stamped on the children; neither their teachers nor their parents are the victims of the sullenness of earth.

I asked myself whether I wanted my own children to be like these, and I answered myself freely and at once: Certainly! They were bright, lively faces that I saw—with a strange preponderance of blonds among them. The children were neither shy nor impudent. They were not peasant children. There was in them a touch of that naturalness and graciousness that we call—without knowing much about it—aristocratic; they were like the children of nobles, carefully but not too obviously brought up.

I do not think that these children will "leave the farm" when they grow up. For in these Jewish colonies the animal dullness of spirit which lies like an immemorial curse on all peasantries is wholly absent. The meretricious attraction of the crowd for its own sake has no power over those who live a full life in what looks like partial seclusion. The isolation is geographic, not intellectual or spiritual. The deadly illusion that one is at the centre of the world because one is at the centre of a mob feeds on a lack of personal content. The men and women

and children of Kfar Gileadi and Tel Hai are at the centre of a world because they are a creation. They already have a history. At Metullah, close by, we found the sculptor Melnikoff, calmly engaged, in the midst of these troubles, on the Lion of Trumpeldor which is to be erected outside Kfar Gileadi.

It is not easy for a half outsider, like myself, to write of these places without seeming affected and sentimental. But my generation, coming to Palestine, is a generation of transition. We are bound to impress ourselves and others with something of wilfulness and artificiality. The most difficult flight in the world is the flight from sophistication: it always looks like an additional and particularly offensive refinement of snobbery or "intellectualism" to speak about the simplicity of others. But I have never felt, elsewhere, so strong a sense of inner independence and fullness as in these colonies.

That feeling of sufficiency came over me strongly a second time when we tarried at Beth Alpha, the last colony of the Emek, where the valley debouches into the lowlands of the Jordan. We reached this place by way of Dagania and Jisr, on the Yarmuk, where, in the midst of a primitive wildness, the neat, startling buildings of the Ruthenberg electrification plant stand up, once more like an assertion of a purposeful will in the heart of ancient chaos. Beth Alpha is younger than Kfar Gileadi. It was

founded eight years ago in a swampy stretch which was sacred to the malaria-carrying anopheles. No human beings lived there. It lies at the foot of the mountains of Gilboa, the nearest hill beginning its precipitous rise twenty paces from the cultivated land of the settlement. The Biblical curse which rested from of old on Gilboa had spilled over on to the land which is now Beth Alpha. The nearest clear running water was more than a mile away, but the water was undrinkable. And the nearest railway station is five kilometres away—but the path was barred, eight years ago, by a muddy rivulet which fed the swamps and provided a paradise for mosquitoes.

The nearest occasional neighbors of the settlers were the Bedouins who cross the Jordan valley. The settlers were drawn from two groups of very young men and women who had organized and trained in Europe—Ha-Shomer Ha-Tzair and Hefzibah: they had passed almost immediately from the school desk to the tent of the pioneer. Their first employment in Palestine was road construction and quarrying. When they had proved their worth in these arduous occupations (we used to be very proud eight or nine years ago of pictures of these boys and girls out of the universities and schools of the West, breaking stones under the tormenting sun of the Valley of Jezreel) they were permitted

to drain swamps in Ain Charod and Tel Yosef. And for their final reward they were offered land not where Beth Alpha is today, but some miles to the west of it, above sea-level (Beth Alpha is below sea-level), and closer to the other settlements. But the two groups, against the wishes of the Zionist Executive, chose Beth Alpha. They lived in tents, drained the swamps, ploughed the land, and established friendly relations with the Bedouins. Some of the pioneers died, and others became invalids. But they established themselves. They went in successfully for dairy farming, corn and vine-growing, poultry and bee-keeping. The swamps were dried up, and malaria almost completely driven out of the place. Huts and stone buildings replaced the tents. Children were born to the settlers, and one of the best schools in Palestine was founded there. Beth Alpha has today a fine library, the pride of the Emek. Children from neighboring colonies are brought to its school.

In Beth Alpha, in Kfar Gileadi, in Dagania, in other colonies we called on, the incredible irrelevance of the quarrel which had been made the starting point of the last riots in Palestine forced itself on the attention like a hideous, uncouth jest. What have these men and women and children—they are the same material that has poured into the rest of Palestine in the last ten years—to do with aspira-

tions toward a mosque, with mean and bitter arguments about ritualistic privileges. For the cream of the horrible joke is—that the Arab agitators point to the newcomers into Palestine as the aggressors and attackers. They don't mind the old Jews who have always been in Palestine. It is the young people, the disturbers of the lethargy of the East, who attract their attention. And the young people, whether they are in Jerusalem or Tel Aviv or Tel Hai or Beth Alpha, are the same in their peculiar wish to re-establish relations with the physical and spiritual sources of life. Who but a grudging and ungenerous enemy (not the mass of the Arabs, but those that feed on their credulity) would associate them with such absurdities as have been made the basis of anti-Jewish propaganda among the Arabs, a desire to capture Moslem sanctuaries and assert the exclusiveness of Jewish ritualistic rights?

. . . . .

Beth Alpha was attacked five times, but only the first two attacks were serious. I obtained the story on the spot, only a few days later, when English soldiers were already on guard. It ran as follows:

"The attacks came from the east, as expected, for Beth Alpha is the breakwater of the Emek settlements. We front the wilderness of the east. The attackers were of the tribe of Sagar, but some also

came from Fakua and from Tubas, which is on the summit of Gilboa. The tribe of Sagar had always been friendly with us. But on Saturday, August the 24th, the Sheikh of that tribe came to warn us. He said that strangers had brought a spirit of unrest into his people, saying there was a fine chance to loot, the Government being indifferent; and now he could not hold them back. He therefore advised us to retreat. (Others in the colony told me that the Sheikh visited Beth Alpha not so much to warn, as to spy out the situation; but others defended him and said his intentions were pure.) On Saturday, therefore, we sent our children inland, to the settlement Geva. And we were not yet certain that an attack would take place. But on Sunday morning we saw the Bedouins gathering, and beginning to make a circle round the place. We therefore sent a runner to Ain Charod, the nearest Jewish colony with a telephone. We did not send him on horseback, because he would have been too conspicuous, but on foot. The running time is two hours. They saw him, and tried to cut him off, and he exchanged shots with them. But he got through safely. From Ain Charod they called up Afule, Nazareth and Beth Shan. In three hours the runner was back, with a contingent of nine men, under the command of Captain Brand. There arrived at the same time twelve men of the Transjordan Frontier police. These and

the men of Beth Alpha held the place against several hundred attackers.

"The first attack was made on Sunday, about one o'clock. The Arabs came in a huge semi-circle, firing as they came. One wing closed toward the vineyards, to draw the defence, while the second wing closed toward the stables, in the hope of making off with the horses and cattle. An attempt at a parley was frustrated. The attack lasted an hour and a half and we kept them off. At the end of an hour and a half they retreated, and lay low until darkness came.

"The night attack, which began at ten o'clock, was more dangerous, because we could not see the attackers. They got close enough to wound two cows and to set fire to some of the grain. But again they were beaten off. We estimated that we killed about twelve of them, and not a single Jew was killed or wounded. On Monday they made three minor attacks. But the worst was over. Since then the English arrived, and watches have been posted day and night.

"The Arabs carried off their dead—all but one. And on Monday certain men of the village of Tubas, by Jenin, came to claim the body. That is how we know that Tubas participated in the attack."

I asked what would happen now. The answer was: "*Gom.* Vendetta. The Arabs, particularly the no-

mads, consider it a point of honor to take one Jewish life for every Arab life the attack cost them."

"But they were the attackers, weren't they?" I asked. "Did they expect you to lie down and be killed?"

"You argue like a Westerner," my informant said, smiling. "Attack or no attack, we killed certain of their men. They must have a life for a life. They will lie in wait for us when we go out singly, to work in the fields, and shoot us down."

"Is there no way out of it?"

"We might negotiate, and pay for every life. Then we would have a splendid ceremony and peace would be declared."

"How much for each life?"

"It varies. The average would be five hundred pounds."

It is perhaps superfluous to add that the colonists had no intention of negotiating and paying. And they had just as little intention of leaving the place. They had made a new world in Beth Alpha, and they would not move. These young men and women who had been students ten years ago, were going to see it through.

. . . . .

While I talked with the colonists of the Emek and the Galilees, I was haunted by many questions.

And one of them was the question of the "experts" who are now engaged in pricing the cost of building up the country, and in showing the colonists where they erred till now. What the experts should say, logically, is that from the practical point of view the colonists erred in ever wanting to do what no expert would have recommended in the beginning. For experts (and I admire experts greatly) are men who step in to show how a thing should be done when impractical men have made it practical. A barefoot colonist, not yet thirty years of age, walked with us round Dagania and discoursed of the geological structure of the surrounding country; of the agents who sold their fruits and vegetables for them in Tel Aviv, Damascus and Alexandria; of the peculiar climatic advantages of the place, which gave them earlier and later crops than those of other colonies; of the interrupted transport, which left their crops now rotting; of the spoiling of other crops because men could not now go out singly to weed and water them; of the man-power being used up in the watches. I heard this talk in many places. But I heard nowhere a complaint as to the situation itself; not a word about retreat or despair. The spirit which had impelled them to come out into the waste, and do things that were accounted mad,—a calm, clear spirit, a fanatical enthusiasm without fanaticism, burned as clearly now as then. But I have not

read in the reports of the experts anything about the nursing or encouragement of this spirit. They say nothing about the price of it. Nor do they calculate the cost in lives and years of these first impossible enterprises. I do not join with those who make fun of experts; but I cannot help saying something about those who treat the expert as a demi-urge, the direct manifestation of the Creator. We need experts in the upbuilding of Palestine, but we need, at the foundation, men who do not calculate the cost to themselves, too exactly; who do not wait until prudence gives its permission. No expert would have advised the founding of Kfar Gileadi and Dagania and Beth Alpha, among other colonies. In fact, no expert would ever have recommended the upbuilding of a Jewish homeland. And I doubt whether any expert ever calculated the effect upon the individual efficiency of pioneers of a vendetta conducted by a neighboring Bedouin tribe. An era of experts is dawning in Zionist life but before we give ourselves up to them completely, let us be quite sure that we have left room for the unpredictable and incalculable elements in the enterprise. For that is the highest form of expertness.

CHAPTER XIII

Foundations of Peace

OUT of Palestine less than a fortnight, I have already heard too many Jews saying resignedly: "I suppose this sort of thing must happen from time to time in the reconstruction of a country." The resignation of these Jews is of the wrong kind. It is the fatalism which regards all war as a natural calamity, uncontrollable, like tidal waves and earthquakes, and almost as unpredictable. And *all* war should not be regarded so. This feeling of resignation is not shared by the Jews of Palestine. The attack need not and should not have happened. When a people is as obstinately determined as the Jews to build in peace and friendship, when that determination is backed by fearlessness, and when every visible effect of Jewish reconstruction on Arab life is economically and intellectually beneficial, it is not natural to assume that "this sort of thing must happen from time to time."

Perhaps nothing goes further to prove the artificiality and irrelevance of the attack than (from the Arab mob-leader's point of view) its complete moral failure. Let us consider the situation as a

whole. In August, 1929, the building of the Jewish homeland received a great forward thrust from the founding of the Jewish Agency, which lifted the reconstruction work definitely out of the field of controversy. Henceforth Jews might oppose the building of the Jewish homeland only on the ground that they were not interested in Jewish things. Whatever the effect on the theory of Zionism, the practical promise is the most important yet registered in Jewish life. Now, if ever, the Arabs of Palestine, if they were deeply and authentically afraid, were to strike a blow.

Circumstances of every kind would have encouraged them. The High Commissioner was absent. Almost every Zionist leader had been drawn to Zürich—a mistake, but a comprehensible one; for working simultanously on two fronts, building a national morale as well as a country, the Zionist leadership had as urgent a task in Zürich as in Palestine. The unrest that hung in the air did not prevent even Vladimir Jabotinsky, who had cried "wolf" so often, from absenting himself from the country to attend the sessions of the Zionist Congress. There was not a quarter of a regiment of English police and soldiers in Palestine. And, above all, a lying and successful campaign of intrigue and propaganda, had set the Arab world by the ears. In the cafés of Jerusalem it was reported that England had

sold Palestine to the Jews for £3,000,000, and Friday, August 23, was the date of delivery. But such rumors were infinitely less potent than the cunning exploitation of religious fears: a crescendo of slander—encouraged by the careful inactivity, and still more careful activity, of the Administration—culminating in the characteristic story that the Jews had bombed the Mosque of Omar.

With all this, the "uprising," as the Arab mob-leaders like to call it, was a failure from within. About one hundred and sixty thousand Jews are surrounded in Palestine by five times as many Arabs: scores of tiny Jewish colonies are isolated among Arab villages. The Jewish self-defence, wherever it existed, was determined—but crippled. And the total result was the killing of about one hundred and thirty Jews—of whom nearly ninety were simply massacred in three exposed places—Hebron, Safed and Motza. This was not the "uprising" that was planned. It was not the "check" on the Jewish will that the uprising was expected to furnish. It was, instead, an exposure of the falseness of claim that the Arabs are opposed to the building of the Jewish homeland; and, by implication, it was a confirmation of the already firmly established belief that peace between the Jews and Arabs is more natural than is enmity—even when the active desire for such peace receives no encouragement from English officialdom.

These general grounds for hope are fortified by details. There were districts in Palestine which flatly refused to move. There were great numbers of individual demonstrations of friendship and loyalty and common sense. We should remember that any Arab who had not been taken in by the hysterical lying of the agitators was not bound to exert himself to save Jewish lives. He could salve his conscience merely by standing by. But from almost every part of the country come stories of generous and perilous rescues. I record a number of them in order that the picture may be balanced. In Petach Tikvah, which in the riots of 1921 was the center of a furious attack, complete peace was preserved in 1929. The assault of 1921 was led by Abou Kishek, a daring young Sheikh (he was then about twenty years of age). On that occasion the Jews, aided by military forces, put up a strong defence, and Arab losses were extremely heavy. Abou Kishek was later arrested and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. After some years he was amnestied by the Government—on Jewish request. A peace covenant was established between the Jews of Petach Tikvah and the Arab tribes of Abou Kishek; the covenant was concluded with sacrifices, accompanied by a splendid religious ceremony.

The peace of 1929 between Petach Tikwah and the tribes under the leadership of Abou Kishek was

voluntary. No one believes that fear played any part in it, for Abou Kishek is reputed to be utterly fearless. He is, in fact, a typical example of that thirteenth century type of chivalry which is still the ideal of the Bedouins. Had his oath stood between him and the desire to attack, he could have obtained absolution by pretending that he had been attacked; or that he had overheard a conspiracy; or that he was defending the Mosque; in fact, by pretending anything. But the desire for peace was there.

In the city of Tiberias, peace was maintained. And here it was even more difficult than in Petach Tikvah. For Migdal, close at hand, was under attack. Bedouins were operating in the district. The town is close to the border. And when I visited Tiberias two weeks after the troubles, there was still a stifled hysteria in the air: each side was afraid of a blunder or of a panic, and the hysteria was proportionate to their desire for peace.

At the very beginning of the troubles the leading Jews and Arabs of Tiberias took council. Two proclamations—one in Hebrew, one in Arabic—were published. I reproduce the Arab proclamation:

"In the name of Allah the Merciful,

"The prayers and peace of our Lord Mohammed and all the Prophets and Apostles;

"To our brothers in Tiberias and the vicinity, the peace and mercy of Allah, and His greetings:

"In order to forestall the results of false rumors which have been circulated concerning conditions in Tiberias; and in order to dispel the fables which disturb the peace, we have assembled with the notables of the Jewish community in the house of his Eminence the Great Mufti, Sheikh Abd Alselim Effendi Tabri, and have taken council on the preservation of peace and order. We have resolved that both sides shall urge and warn their respective communities to maintain peace and quiet. We therefore proclaim that we vehemently oppose every action which disturbs the peace of the population, and we pray to God the Omnipotent to inspire us with His will. We warn our brothers that they must maintain the peace and go about their work, for that alone is useful. Let them keep far from ways which are illegal and are not desired by the community. Let them keep far from quarrels, for Allah detests the quarrelsome."

Here follow the signatures of the Arab notables of Tiberias and the vicinity.

I reproduce below some extracts from a diary which was kept by a Jew of Ben Shemen. It needs no comment:

"Friday, August 23rd. With the first rumors of the events in Jerusalem, a feeling of unrest spread

among the Arabs in the vicinity. Our situation, a small Jewish island in the heart of an Arab sea, is a difficult one.

"We learned of preparations in Ludd to attack us, and of the incitement of emissaries from the towns among the villages surrounding us. We made preparations for the defence of the settlement. The women and children of the settlement were brought into the farm of Kfar ha-Noar (the children's colony), which was stocked with food and water for several days. A guard was organized. Most of the children of Kfar ha-Noar had been sent to Tel Aviv, for safety, but we could not transfer all of them in time because the roads had become dangerous. We are astounded by the quiet and serious behavior of the children, and by their exertions in the difficult preparations for defence.

"Meanwhile exaggerated reports have reached Ludd about hundreds of Arab casualties in Jaffa. One report is that not an Arab is left alive in Jaffa. A demonstration attended by a big crowd was organized. It was resolved that one half of the crowd should go to aid Jaffa and the other half should march on Ben Shemen to take revenge. A big crowd set out for Ben Shemen, but it was stopped by the elders of the town and by some of our friends. They recalled the great assistance which Ben Shemen had rendered Ludd when that town was destroyed by

FUNGT
SCHOOL OF T TECH

the earthquake, and the friendly relations which had always existed between Ludd and Ben Shemen. A young Arab who had spent some time in Ben Shemen after the earthquake, was also active in our favor. They succeeded, with much effort, in turning the crowd back toward the town.

"At the same time the agitation in the villages had become more intense, and three villages in our neighborhood—Hadid, Beth Navlah and Badros—began preparations for a night attack. We were compelled to divide our small force, to protect ourselves from all sides. In this desperate situation, two Sheikhs of the vicinity visited us and suggested that we bring our children to them, for safety. We did not find it possible to do this. The Sheikhs stayed with us. We arranged sleeping quarters for them in front of the house. Some of our Arab friends in Ludd came and joined them. The fact that Arab notables were keeping watch made a strong impression. The behavior of the Arab policeman stationed here was also excellent. He absented himself suddenly, and after an hour returned with the Mukhtar of Kfar Hadid: he had arrested him and brought him as a hostage. The shouts of an Arab crowd were soon heard. We made ready to defend ourselves, but this was only a crowd of Arabs from Kfar Hadid, come to demand their Mukhtar. At night the captain, Halim Bostah, came. He forced the Arabs, who had

already marched against us, to return; he summoned the Mukhtars of the villages and charged them with the responsibility for any wrong which might be done to Ben Shemen. All this frustrated the planned attacks of the villages. It should be mentioned that Captain Halim Bastah behaved very carefully, and always appeared at the right moment.

"Monday, August 26th. Rumors reported from Ludd again caused anxiety. Preparations were being made for the funeral of one who had been killed in the clash at Jaffa, and it was feared that the funeral would change into a demonstration which would attack us. We received messages to the effect that serious preparations for an attack were being made, and that there was no hope of holding the rioters this time. The optimism we had felt after our first success died out. Again we made preparations. This time we fortified the side which faces Ludd.

"In the afternoon one of our friends came from Ludd and told us of an improvement in the situation. The notables of Ludd had assembled and had resolved to exert themselves to the utmost to prevent the disgrace of an attack by a large town like Ludd on a children's colony. One of the notables resolved to transfer his family to us as hostages for our safety. Later four comrades arrived from Tel Aviv. This, besides adding quantitatively

to our strength, gave us our first contact with the Jewish community. This night too the Sheikhs stayed at our house, to keep watch. In the evening we saw a big fire on the southern horizon. We took it to be Huldah, burning. We were depressed that evening by the thought of the destruction of the colony, and of the impossibility of sending them help.

"Tuesday, August 27th. Our neighbors seem to be jealous of the Arabs of Huldah, and as they have not been able to attack us, they are preparing to set fire to this settlement.

"British patrols passing through the villages began to visit us. Now we are surer than ever that we will not be compelled to abandon the place.

"Sunday, September 1st. The impression is strong that we are out of danger. Our only damages are thefts perpetrated in the houses we had to leave when we shortened our front.

"Telephone connection is resumed, though in the meantime only with the representative of the Zionist Executive. With the help of an English guard we succeeded in transferring the remainder of the children. Only the young and the mature men remain in the place."

Besides these instances of entire vicinities which refused to be implicated in the orgy of murder and robbery, the reader will remember villages and districts already covered in the narrative. Many indi-

vidual instances in Jerusalem, in Hebron, in Gaza have also been quoted. As I have found it impossible to go into all the details of the assaults on Jewish cities and settlements, so I find it impossible to go into all the details of these demonstrations of humanity. I quote a few more because they not only show good will, but uncover a determination which springs from a sense of honor. Men may make a gesture of kindliness; they may even risk something for the sake of their neighbors. But when we see men exerting a long cunning and patience and courage to defend the lives of the attacked, we assume the pretence of something deeper than mere kindliness—namely, a feeling of honor. Such a case is the following:

"We four Jewish workers (Selig Sturman, Benzion Nehushtan, Zevi Shel, Arieh Brabman) were working on Friday, August 23rd, in the Government quarry near Bethlehem. Sixty-one Arabs are also employed there. At twelve-thirty motor cars full of Arabs began to pass by. The shouts of Arab workers to slaughter us were heard. We assembled then in the dynamite store. We prepared to defend ourselves and we waited for the Government car to take us home. Our Arab fellow workers all remained in their place. At three-thirty the strain became very great. Arab crowds kept passing along the road. Two Arabs, on guard at the quarry, inti-

mated to passing Arabs that there were Jews in the quarry. When we heard of this we went to the Italian cloister about four hundred yards from the quarry, intending to stay there for the night and to connect meanwhile with some Jewish national or some Government institution. . . . The nuns were afraid to shelter us and we returned to the quarry. There we took counsel with the foreman of the Arab workers. He told us that the situation was difficult, but that they would defend us to the last drop of their blood. Before our talk was over fifteen Arabs armed with rifles, revolvers, clubs and knives had surrounded the store. We stood at the door and listened to the discussion between the rioters and the workers. Some of the workers were for giving us up. . . . The Moslem workers from Kfar Zurbahir, Ein Kerem and Kfar Artes stood at the door and prevented the raiders from entering . . ."

After a stormy discussion between the rioters and the workers, the former withdrew.

"We called Mohammed Gaber, the leader of the defenders, and asked him to give us Arab clothes. We learned that they had already obtained them, and that they were preparing to transfer us to their village. We were taken to the village Zurbahr, surrounded by the defenders, and on the way several attempts were made to attack us. At one point the *abayah* (Arab cloak) on one of our comrades

slipped off, and his trousers were revealed. A Bedouin perceived him and shouted 'A Jew! After him!' The Arabs defended us cleverly. They caught the rioter, who was armed with a rifle, and stopped his cries with his *caffia* (headcloth). In the village, again, attempts were made by Bedouins to storm the house, but the inhabitants of the village repelled the raiders. Saturday morning we summoned the Mukhtar of the village and told him to go to Bethlehem and telephone to the Public Works department to rescue us. But the post office at Bethlehem refused to give him the connection, and he returned disappointed."

On Saturday the workers were missed in Jerusalem, and a party, accompanied by two English soldiers, set out to rescue them. But the searchers could not find them. In the village where the four Jews were concealed hot discussions began to take place concerning their fate. It was getting harder to keep them.

"We were transferred to another house. From the talk of some children a Bedouin, Suliman Tamari, learned of our new hiding place and tried to break into the house. The neighbors defended us, and he turned back. During the time of the siege the Arabs supplied us with food, cigarettes, water for washing, and night clothes. . . .

"Our house was situated on a slope. We asked to

be taken to the summit of the village that we might see what was happening in the surroundings. Saturday, at four in the afternoon, I went up in Arab clothes to the roof of one of the houses. The sight was frightful: hundreds of Bedouins crouched on the earth, in the attack on Talpioth. They were all barefoot, clad in shirts, each with two or three belts of bullets, and a rifle . . ."

On Monday morning, at five o'clock, the landlord, together with three other Arabs smuggled the Jewish workers, by a stratagem, past the Arab mobs and into Jerusalem. For forty-eight hours these Jews had been sheltered and defended in the very centre of the Arab storm round Jerusalem. It is an extraordinary record.

From Kiriath Anavim, from Tul Kerem, and from other points, similar reports were sent in. By Kiriath Anavim, one Arab notable of Aby Gush came to offer his children as hostages for the safety of the Jews. The Mukhtar of Beth Akiba, near Kiriath Anavim, came with assurances of safety and friendship. Round Kiriath Anavim no unpleasant incidents occurred.

These stories of Arab-Jewish friendship came to light of themselves. But on September 12 the Jewish National Council passed a resolution of thanks to "the many members of the English community in this country for their valiant defence of the Jewish

population," and invited all Jews who had been saved or aided by Arabs to make the names of their rescuers known, so that "the Jewish National Council might send them the thanks of the Jewish population."

The attitude of the Jewish National Council throughout the entire storm was remarkable in its restraint and statesmanship. Just as the township of Tel Aviv held back for two days the news of the Hebron massacre, directing its first efforts toward the preservation of peace, so the Jewish National Council exerted itself, from beginning to end, to calm the resentment and despair of the Jews. The day after the storm broke in Jerusalem, when it was known that official help was weak in substance and spirit, the Jewish National Council issued an appeal to the Jews of Palestine. After touching on the provocations that had been offered to the Jews, and the crimes that had been committed against them, the National Council proclaims that:

"1. The most important thing at this moment is to overcome our sorrow, master our feelings, and energetically maintain the peace and the public discipline:

"2. We warn every member of the Jewish community to refrain from action of any kind which may be regarded as violence or revenge.

"Any act committed in defiance of this warning, will be regarded as an act of treachery."

As in this, so in every utterance of Jewish leaders in Palestine a deep sense of the need for peace, and of the ultimate triumph of peace, prevails over every other passion. Before the last attacks, during the attacks, and after them, the responsible Jewish leaders saw that the real problem was being obscured by false issues. Events have been too strong for them physically, but not morally. They, at any rate, kept their heads.

A year ago, shortly after the miserable incident of the screen at the Wailing Wall, Ben Gurion, one of the foremost labor leaders in Palestine, said before the National Council:

"In the Wailing Wall question we must take care not to fall into the trap prepared by hostile British officials who desire to instigate here a bloody religious war. It is not a dispute between the Arabs and us. The Government has offered us offence—not the Arabs. We shall try to get into direct touch with the Arabs in regard to the buying of the passage before the Wailing Wall, which to us is holy and to them is only a question of property. If we do not succeed in the present hysterical situation, we will succeed after a year."

Only one-half of this remarkable statement was prophetic—the British officials were more success-

ful than the Jewish statesmen. Today we are infinitely further than even a year ago from the solution of the question.

Another passage from this speech is worth quoting now. Ben Gurion repudiates the suggestion, which he attributes to Vladimir Jabotinsky, that it is useless to appeal to the Arabs direct. "In his (Jabotinsky's) opinion, all political action should be directed toward England, and as far as England is concerned, he is very optimistic that he will find justice there. I do not put in doubt the feeling of justice of the British Nation, in spite of the impudence of British officials here. But why this pessimism on the part of Jabotinsky as to the feeling of justice among Arabs and the Moslem world? Does he suppose that justice is a monopoly of the British Empire?"

Ben Gurion continues:

"What we lack is not the control of the Wailing Wall—we are in need of Jews in Palestine. We shall concentrate all our efforts in that direction. This is the beginning and end of all policy. And an important condition for the fulfilment of this task is peace with our neighbors."

This was said a year ago. On the very eve of the outbreaks, on August 20th, the Labor daily *Davar* wrote: "We have reached a point now when we cannot even demand the full solution of the

Wailing Wall question, because nobody can give us that solution. The Wailing Wall is not in English hands, and we shall not demand of the English that they give it to us, using for that purpose only their physical force. Even if they were prepared to do this, we would be obliged to refuse the present. We must strive first to create a quiet atmosphere in regard to the Wailing Wall. Months and perhaps years must pass before the events of yesterday (August 19) will be forgotten. The *status quo* must be carefully preserved. The Government must exercise the utmost vigilance not to cause offence and not to impair the rights of Jews in regard to the Wailing Wall. When this hour will have passed, and with it the anger which is bound up with this question, the Wailing Wall will cease to be a pressing problem and a means of prestige and power for Arab Leaders, *and a means of provocation to others.*"

And after the bloody events (if we may yet use the word after) the attitude of responsible leaders is as restrained and careful. The instigators of the riots would achieve a complete triumph if they could drive a permanent wedge between Jews and Arabs, rouse emotions which lead to desperate acts and words which can never be undone or unsaid. But the attitude of Jewish Palestine is summed up

in the statement of the weekly *Ha-Poel Ha-Tzair* (August 30):

"Since the days of the Crusades no such massacre of Jews in Palestine has occurred. Under barbaric and semi-barbaric régimes, during many centuries of wars and changes of rulership, during periods of political anarchy, no events took place like these, which have taken place under modern, enlightened British rule.

"The fearful massacre of the Jews of Hebron, the slaughter of children, of Yeshivah students, of the helpless and defenceless: the butchery in Motza, the murders in Jerusalem and Haifa, in Hulda, Ber Tuvia and Safed—no dust can ever cover this blood, and no political cunning will cleanse those who are responsible for this carnage.

"We have no dispute with the Arab nation. It was blindly misled by political agitators, and by agents who circulated lies among the Arabs and stirred up the instincts of murder and robbery.

"But we have a case against the British Government. Its duty was to prevent the disaster, and it could have done it, if it had not refrained from action. . . . The cynical behavior of some of the Palestinian officials raises the suspicion that there were those who wanted the disturbances and had secret motives in desiring them. . . .

"We believe profoundly and with justice that

since the riots of 1920 and their recurrence in 1921, some persons in the Palestine Administration hate our constructive and colonization work, intrigue against it, desire its failure, and actively or passively support the organization of riots against us. There have been four recurrences of disturbances against the Jews in Palestine during the British occupation, and none of them can be considered a spontaneous and unforeseen outbreak. In all of them the evidence of preparation and organization could be detected, and all of them were accompanied by the famous slogan: 'The Government is with us.' . . .

"Our forefathers wrote elegies on massacres like those of Hebron, Safed and Motza, and preserved their memory in the tears of the Jewish exile. We will not mourn with broken hearts. We will not be discouraged. On the contrary, our connection with the country will be strengthened and our constructive work stimulated. We, at any rate, will not leave Palestine. Our return to this country and the reconstruction of our national life here constitute a historic destiny which cannot be undone by cunning officials, malefactors and rioters. . . . We mourn for the Arab blood which was shed; it was not the blood of the instigators, but of those who followed blindly. We do not desire and we shall not seek revenge. Vengeance is a false comfort, and not less abominable than rioting. But we will not aban-

don our positions. We shall not give up any part of our right to return in masses to Palestine, to build this country, and to live here our free national life. Let this be known to our Arab neighbors, *and let it be known to those who advise them evilly to shed our blood, in order that they may in turn, afterwards shed Arab blood.*"

In the midst of the anguish and humiliation of these days, the same note of careful justice is sounded again by *Davar,* (September 11):

"We say to ourselves and to others, in these hard days: the wild and cruel acts of certain Arab circles *determine our relations to the authors of the acts, but do not determine our relations to the Arab people as a whole. . . .*

"There were not only the deceivers, but the deceived: the tools of a criminal Arab policy. Many of them certainly believed the impudent slanders which were circulated by their leaders: the slander that we desire to occupy the Mosque, the fable of the five hundred killed in Jerusalem before any blood was shed. The level of education, the level of public and spiritual consciousness in the masses, the blind acceptance of slanders which the Government did not deny—these are factors which mitigate the guilt of the individual rioters. But the murderer, the plunderer, the incendiary shall receive his punish-

ment. But *he,* he alone, and not another: not his brother in race or religion.

"A certain Arab of Hebron is guilty of murder. He was caught with the bloodstained dagger in his hand. A certain Arab of Hebron is guilty of robbery. The evidence of his crime is available. They shall receive their punishment. But an Arab of Jaffa is not responsible for the actions of other Arabs of Hebron and Safed. Every attempt to put upon him a responsibility which is not his, is unjust—and we will do wrong to no one. The atmosphere around us is already too heavily laden with injustice. Collective responsibility may be an administrative measure to quell riots; in the concept of peoples, in the relations between peoples, it has no place. . . . Any idea of collective responsibility of the whole Arab nation, *i.e.,* of every individual Arab, is an additional disaster from the human, the political and the colonization point of view. If it were to become prevalent in the Yishub it would lower it (the Jewish population of Palestine) to the level of the robbers and rioters. . . .

"As we do not blame the English nation, and not even its Government for the action of some of its officials in this country, so we dare not accuse the whole Arab nation of the wrong inflicted on us by Arab leaders and groups of murderers and robbers.

"The Arab losses in life are considerable, too. In

the Arab camp also there are widows, orphans, mothers who will never be comforted. The Arab national movement will bear during many years the inheritance of crime which has been created for it by its leaders, and the deliverance from this inheritance will be bought deeply by the inner quarrels which must arise in the Arab camp when the first minutes of frenzy will have passed. Generation will rise against generation in the bitterness of disillusionment."

(The fulfilment of this prophecy came about sooner than even the writer may have expected. Within two weeks after the massacre of Hebron, the grapes were rotting in the surrounding vineyards: for the Jews were the greatest local consumers. Nor was the Jerusalem market open any more. A measure of grapes sold for half a piastre, instead of eight piastres, and there were few buyers. Quarrels broke out among the Arabs of Hebron and one family accused the other of being responsible. By September 13th, *El Aktam,* an Arab newspaper, reported that in the Arab village of Ag'ur (in the Hebron district) a memorandum was prepared petitioning the Government to hold the President of the Moslem Council (*i.e.,* the Grand Mufti) responsible for the riots. About the time I left Tel Aviv a poison scare had been thrown into the city by some actual cases of poisoned fruit and vegetables: this tightened

the boycott against Arab products, which had begun to come in again into the city. Tel Aviv spends between ten and twenty thousand dollars a week among surrounding villages for fruit and vegetables; and for a week we ate no greens; the year was ruined for many Arab villages, the innocent villages with the guilty. In Haifa and in Jaffa the *Katzenjammer* of the riots was already strongly felt among the Arabs.)

Davar continues:

"Not only are we forbidden to charge the whole Arab nation with this responsibility, and to permit this strange idea to fix our attitude, but we must not try to solve our internal problems in the light of recent events. This much we can learn: the need for a quick increase in the Jewish population, the concentration of settlements and quarters, the avoidance of scattering, etc. . . . However, in the economic and social fields we cannot play the game of those who endeavor to divide the country into two populations, hostile to each other. The economic and social reconstruction of the Yishub is always a necessity, and in particular at a time of external danger. But from this reconstruction to the social and economic boycott of the Arab population is a far cry. . . .

"We have a struggle against those responsible for the disaster everywhere—among the British officials

and the Arab leaders. But we are not at war with the Arab population of Palestine."

I have cited these views at length precisely because their moderation and calmness are in such contrast with the extreme provocation of the times. And from the words quoted it will be seen that it is easier for the Jews of Palestine to forgive the crimes of the flesh than the crimes of the spirit. Men who kill have at worst reverted to the brute from which they sprang. But men who use their intelligence to debase an ideal will find no forgiveness, because their crimes come under the heading of sin against the Holy Ghost. The physical loss we have suffered in Palestine is of little moment to a vital and resilient people. But the baseness of the incident to which Jews and Arabs were both made party is a greater setback. This attempt to drag us down to the level of bandits and intrigants, this emergence of the hideous war propaganda which makes fools and beasts of men,—this is a crime of the darker type.

It was a crime committed upon Jews and Arabs —and upon England no less. I cannot unravel the complex of motives which impelled England to champion the cause of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; and I do not believe in attributing policies to nations—the trick is too simple. But no constellation of circumstances was so apt as this one to honor England and help the world forward. I see the

tangle of Imperial needs and motives of honor; sometimes these forces are at cross purposes, sometimes they re-inforce each other. I do not expect, in a world so compromised by its own past, an instantaneous moral revolution. But here, in Palestine, it seemed to me that one of those happy chances which come to help humanity out of the troubles of its own making had again risen to the surface. What need is there for intrigue (unless the need is a fever) when sympathy and understanding will serve the purpose better? The Jews who have come to Palestine—they are a handful so far—brought with them a queer combination of characteristics: morality without censoriousness, intellectuality without decadence. England did not have to deal here with a furious, fanatical group—the kind of people whose impatience with human weaknesses make human progress impossible. For these people were still stronger: their clean purposes could endure through the devious processes of realization. The stage was set in Palestine for an experiment of a kind which seemed to me—still seems to me—peculiarly fitted for the genius of England. Never, I think, has the genius of England been more hideously misrepresented than by the handful of men she has sent, thoughtlessly, to be her representatives in this partnership.

Morally I claim only the remote kinship of admiration with the Jewish pioneers of Palestine. But

on that sunny afternoon when I ran down the road from Tel Aviv, with a club in my hand, to meet some Arab or other with whom I had no quarrel, and who, God knows, had no quarrel with me, the hideous folly and unsympathy of the English official attitude in Palestine was revealed as by a symbol and made me even more sick than the incident itself. What had all this to do with our work? What had it to do with the national problems that faced us, and the personal problems I had set myself? We want to work, not to fight. And is it conceivable that we, backed by English intelligence and skill, cannot avoid the rousing of the passions which undo the good that is in men?

Are there not, in England, men better fitted for the work in Palestine, than those who make up the spirit of the present local Administration? Must this, too, be one of her historic failures, like the thirteen colonies? The boyhood years I spent in England, the love I bear for her, the belief I have in her reservoirs of men and ideas, all these impel me to say, No. True, we cannot expect that English statesmen, harassed by so many national, colonial and international problems, shall devote more than a small part of their time to this problem of Palestine. But those who regard Palestine as one of the ordinary administrative tasks of England are in error; for the moral issues attached to this fragment of the world are out of all proportion to its area,

or to the numbers of men and women involved. And England has shown a curious greatness in her production of types: she has given men of understanding to all sorts of alien causes, and to many remote peoples. Has she none for the Jews and for Palestine?

What is it that we would ask these men to understand? Chiefly that the upbuilding of a Jewish homeland in Palestine does not come under the heading of commonplace colonial tasks—if any such tasks are commonplace; that Palestine is not simply the home of one hundred and sixty thousand Jews and seven hundred and fifty thousand Arabs—two groups between whom a balance of power must be preserved with the stale ingenuities of the old diplomacy; that Palestine is the center of a creative hope for many millions of Jews, awakening in them motives more than ordinarily clean, and energies which the world can use.

I have often been told that there is a special super-subtlety in political problems; that we must not apply ordinary common sense and sympathy to group relationships. And I do not believe it. Nor does the world as a whole believe it. The only ones who believe it any longer are the lineal descendants of the old school of diplomatists: now discredited, replaced by a simpler and more forthright type; and (here is perhaps the center of the Palestinian prob-

lem) relegated to the second place, to a minor officialdom, where in the course of its decline it still fights against the new spirit. I hardly care whether Palestine becomes a Seventh Dominion, a part of the British Empire, or an independent State. These things are coming to mean less and less. I care only that we shall be permitted to make of Palestine the center of a renewed civilization, the refuge not simply of our homeless, but of our thwarted creative will. I refuse to base our claim to England's and the world's coöperation on anything less simple or more professional.

1722

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

DS 126 .S2 1929

S[illegible]-1972.

W[illegible]estine

DATE DUE

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN DS126.S2 1929
Samuel, Maurl What happened in Palestine
3 0645 0001 8275 4